THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE

by

DEAN LOY BILDERBACK

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
1966

Approved by Howard Kaminsky
(Chairman of Supervisory Committee)

Department History
Department of History

Date 2 March 1966

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Date: 18 February 1966

We have carefully read the dissertation entitled "The Membership of the Council of Basle" submitted by Dean Loy Bilderback in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and recommend its acceptance. In support of this recommendation we present the following joint statement of evaluation to be filed with the dissertation.

Mr. Dean Loy Bilderback's doctoral dissertation, The Composition of the Council of Basle, represents, in the judgement of this committee, a significant contribution to the study of the Council. The previous scholarly literature is soundly discussed and evaluated; the outstanding problems connected with the nature and development of the Council are defined; and Mr. Bilderback then shows how his contribution, a statistical analysis of the Council's membership, can throw light on several of these problems. The statistical analysis itself is presented in a rigorously organized form, tabulated in a number of different ways, and completed by a full index of all the participants; the data thus made accessible will certainly provide a nuch-needed basis of fact for future study of the Council of Basle.

DISSERTATION HEADING COMMITTEE: Howard Kaminsky

Solomon Katz

Scott Lytle

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Washington I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Dean Loy Boldebach

Date March 3, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE STUDY OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE 1

The Sources 1

John of Segovia's Historia gestorum synodi basiliensis 1

The protocols of the Council and the Concilium Basilense 16

The works of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini . . . 19

Giovanni Domenico Mansi and the Sacrorum conciliorum nova, et amplissima collectio 21

The Study of the Sources. 25

The comprehensive studies 26

Noel Valois's Le Pape et le Concile (1418-1450) 29

The monographic studies of the Council. . . 30

The Consideration of the Problem of Membership in the Study of the Council of Basle. 31

This Study. 48

The presentation of the study 49

The problems preventing the establishment of the size of the Council 51

The limitations of this study 56

CHAPTER PAGE

II. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE. 62
The Origins 62
The Opening (Period I: February, 1431 - February, 1432) 71
The membership. 79
III. THE HUSSITE NEGOTIATIONS AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PAPAL RECOGNITION (PERIOD II. MARCH, 1432 - JANUARY, 1434). 82
The Hussite Negotiations. 83
The Struggle for Papal Recognition. 89
The Membership. 96
The geographical origins. 98
The ranks and offices of the members. 103
IV. REFORM, REUNION, AND DISSOLUTION (PERIOD III: FEBRUARY, 1434 - SEPTEMBER, 1437) 105
Reform. 106
The reform work of the earlier Councils . . . 109
The reform work at Basle. 112
The reform work and the Council's membership. 115
Reunion 126
The background. 126
The work of the Council 129

CHAPTER PAGE
Dissolution 136
The Membership. 137
V. THE DEPOSITION OF EUGENE IV (PERIOD IV: OCTOBER, 1437 - JUNE, 1439) 140
VI. THE END OF THE COUNCIL. 155
The Elevation of Felix V. 155
The Epilog (Period IV: August, 1440 - August, 1443) 168
VII. CONCLUSION. 171
Summary 171
A Comparison of the Memberships of the Councils of Basle and Constance 175
The Failure of Conciliarism at Basle. 178
BIBLIOGRAPHY. 181
APPENDICES. 190

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would be impossible to acknowledge all of those whose help and encouragement have made the completion of this dissertation possible; yet there are those whose contributions must be noted. Professors Oswald P. Backus, Ambrose Saricks, and James Seaver, and Dean Francis Heller of the University of Kansas have offered invaluable advice and encouragement over the years, and for this I thank them. At the University of Washington I must acknowledge the assistance of Professor Howard Kaminsky, whose standards of excellence have served as a model and a challenge, and Professor Dauril Alden, whose friendship, advice, and assistance have been helpful beyond recognition.

I must also recognize the contribution of the library of the University of California at Berkeley. The enlightened policies of that institution and the courtesy and helpfulness of its staff have quite literally made it possible for me to continue my work in recent years.

The love, understanding, encouragement, and generosity of my parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Bilderback, are responsible in great measure for any accomplishments that are mine. The love, selflessness, and patience of my wife, Betty, have been equally important in allowing me to pursue my work in my own way. To these, my parents and my wife, and to my children, Barbara and Bill, this dissertation is dedicated.

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE

Our understanding of the Council of Basle, like our understanding of any historical topic, is dependent upon the traces it left and the careful interpretation of these by students who were curious to know why it happened, what it did, and how it complemented or altered the happenings around it. It seems proper, then, to introduce this study of an aspect of the Council through a short consideration of its sources and a review of some of the most important and pertinent works on the subject.

I. THE SOURCES

What we know of the Council is rooted, by and large, in four great sources, the _Historia gestorum synodi basiliensis_ of John of Segovia, the protocols of the conciliar notaries Peter Bruneti and Jacob Hüglin, the various writings of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, and the documents collected by Giovanni Domenico Mansi. There are other sources, of course, but they are insignificant in comparison with these which we must consider individually.

John of Segovia's Historia gestorum synodi basiliensis. This work is the most important and comprehensive single source for the study of the Council. Its author is assumed to have been a native of Segovia, but little is known of his origin, education, or background except that in 1432 he gained the chair of theology at the University of Salamanca and in April, 1433, appeared at the Council, the ambassador of his King and the proctor for his University.[1] A study of his career at the Council reveals him to have been a strong partisan of the conciliar cause and one of the leading figures of the synod. In 1434 he was a member of the committee which considered the terms by which the papal representatives were to be allowed to preside over the Council, the final consideration in the solution of the crisis between the Council and the Papacy which had occupied the Council since its inception. His position in the crisis of 1437 over the issue of the location of the talks with the Greeks, the issue which finally split the Council, is unclear, but in December of that year he signed the document that declared Eugene contumacious and started the sequence of events which led to Eugene's deposition by the Council and the election of the Antipope, Felix V.[2] John remained loyal to the Council until its end when he exchanged his office of Cardinal, bestowed by Felix V, for the titular archiepiscopacy of Caesarea, the pallium for which he received from Nicholas V.[3] He then retired to a Savoyard monastery where he devoted himself to the conversion of the Moors, a part of this work being the translation of the Koran into Latin and the composition of a tract, _De gladio spiritus mittendo in Saracenos_, designed to refute its errors.[4]

---

[1] There is a biography of John, Zimmermann, A., *Juan de Segovia*, (Breslau: 1882), and two more recent studies, Frommherz, Uta, *Johannes von Segovia als Geschichtschreiber des Konzils von Basel*, (Basel: 1960) and Diener, Hermann, "Zur Persönlichkeit des Johannes de Segovia: Ein Beitrag zur Methode der Auswertung päpstlicher Register des späten Mittelalters," *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven*, XLVI. Diener presents a great deal of hitherto unknown, incidental information about John's early life. The edition of the *Historia* in the *Monumenta Conciliorum* (hereafter cited *M.C.*) has no introduction, but Johann Haller has supplied an excellent discussion of John in Volume 1 of the *Concilium Basiliense* (hereafter cited C.B.), pp. 20-53, which contains not only a biographical study but discusses as well his attitudes toward the Council and analyzes the possible sources of the *Historia*. The foreword to Volume X of the *Deutsche Reichstagsakten* (hereafter cited DRTA) by L. Quidde presents a discussion of the Historia, "Die Konzilschronik des Johannes von Segovia," pp. LXXIX-LXXII. For John's arrival at Basle, see C.B., 1, 20f.

The date of the authorship of the _Historia_, or more accurately the commencement of its authorship, is disputed. Johann Haller holds that it could not have been begun before 1450 because the early pages contain a reference to a work of John's which was not written until 1449.[5] Herre,[6] however, following Quidde, presents the view that the work was in process by 1440 since John implies that his journey to Bourges in that year interrupted its writing. Even if the earlier date is correct the work should not be viewed as a memoir or diary. The materials incorporated into the Historia are drawn together from certain sources in keeping with a preconceived plan calculated to present an exposition of certain, select considerations of the Council.

---

[2] _C.B._, 1, 22ff.

[3] _Ibid._, 40.

[4] _Ibid._, 42.

[5] _Ibid._, 43.

[6] Hermann Herre, _C.B._, VII, p. LV. Here is a most curious remark. Herre says, "_Ich habe an einer anderen Stelle darauf hingewiesen, dass die Konzilschronik des Johannes von Segovia nicht erst nach 1450 entstanden sein könne_," and then refers the reader to the _DRTA_ Bd. X, lxxxi, which is a part of

The Historia is based upon various letters, decrees, etc., relative to the Council which John must have had at his disposal[7] since they are reproduced in full or in lengthy extract on almost every page, as well as the notarial records of the sessions of the deputations and general congregations.[8] It would be a serious error to discount the importance of the author's memory, but it would be even more erroneous to assume

---

the foreword prepared by L. Quidde. The tenth volume of the DRTA, however, is under the general editorship of Herre.

[7] The problem of exactly how it was that John had access to these documents is inextricably bound with the problem of when the Historia was written. If it was begun and substantially finished while the Council was in progress, as Quidde maintains, then the answer is obvious. John simply used the conciliar archives; if, on the other hand, the work was not begun until after 1450, as Haller says, it would seem that John must have taken a considerable bulk of materials into retirement with him. For a discussion of this see DRTA, X, lxxxi.

[8] The relationship between the various notarial records and the Historia has been thoroughly investigated and discussed. See Haller, C.B., I, 46f., C.B., VII, lv-lxiii; Quidde, DRTA, lxiv, lxxxi.

that this memory was central in John's reconstruction of the Council. The Historia begins with the first summoning of the Council in 1431, and even though John did not arrive until well into 1433 the intricacies of the early months of the Council are well and fully treated. John was one of the leaders in the Council and as such was often dispatched on legations for the Council which necessitated his absence from Basle for months at a time, the most notable example of this being the journey to Bourges which lasted from February until September, 1440; yet the Historia does not suffer for these absences. John maintains the continuity and fullness of his narrative by his heavy dependence upon the notarial protocols, the official minutes of the Council. A comparison of the protocols and the Historia at almost any point reflects this close relationship, and both Haller and Herre supply copious examples of it.[9] There is no agreement upon which of the several notarial records John depended. The problem is complicated because there were perhaps as many as five complete protocols and the possibility of an unknown number of extracts.[10] Regardless of the resolution of the intricate problems which surround the origins of the Historia, it is clear that the author composed and intended to compose a formal survey of the Council from its records.

---

[9] C.B., I, 46-48; C.B., II, lvi-lvii. Also compare the listings of the members of the Council as distributed among the various deputations in February, 1432 as listed by Bruneti, C.B., I, 46-47, and by John, M. C., II, 128.

[10] C.B., I. 46f.

One of the peculiarities of the study of the Council of Basle is the fact that the two most important and extensive sources, the Historia of John of Segovia and the notarial record of the Council left by Peter Bruneti and Jacob Hüglin, have a strange relationship. The Historia follows very closely and perhaps even depends upon the protocols yet goes so far beyond them in depth and perception. Gustav Beckman accurately presents the difference between the Historia, or Chronik as he calls it, and the protocols relative to their use as historical sources when he observes:

> In general the protocol has the advantage of a rigid chronological framework, the Chronik that of the systematic correlation of kindred topics; the protocol presents in the successive daily deliberations of the deputatio pro communibus and the Conclusions of the Committee of Twelve a ponderable part of that which the Chronik, for the most part, is wanting, namely the preliminary deliberations for the General Congregations and the Public Sessions; the Chronik, however, gives many demonstrations and utterances of opinion which took place outside the deputations, General Congregations, and Public Sessions in the Nations, special committees, private conversations, or public disputations and makes considerable use of the text of the acts, such as the responses, decisions, and decrees of the Council, while in the protocols, ignoring a few exceptions, these are wanting.[11]

This is a splendid evaluation of the difference between the two accounts of the Council and can be used as a guide to their respective uses, but it does not account for the reason behind the variance of the two sources. The protocols of Jacob Hüglin and Peter Bruneti were prepared as official records, a notarial abstract of the proceedings, and their form was dictated by their intended function. The Historia, however, was a history of the proceedings, written to inform future generations of what had transpired, and consequently the work represents the execution of a literary plan. The protocols are but records of certain meetings, and the defects they may have as an historical record result from their nature; what did not transpire in the meetings which they record is, by definition, not recorded. The wants in the Historia, however, result from the conscious decision of the author to exclude certain considerations because, as Mandell Creighton says in regard to one omission, the author "perhaps thought it beneath the dignity of his serious history."[12]

---

[11] C.B., VI, xcvii.

The greatest weakness of the Historia as a guide to the understanding of the Council is John's preoccupation with what the Council produced to the prejudice, if not the exclusion, of any consideration of how the Council functioned. The negotiations with the Hussites or with the Greeks, the struggles with the Papacy, and the relations with the Emperor and the other secular magnates are treated fully and well, and the dealings of the Council with outside entities might well be called the central concern of John's work. The Historia is similarly strong in its treatment of the official position of the Council on the matters which were of greatest concern to it: the reform measures, reductory work among the Greeks and Hussites, and the efforts to attain and maintain peace among the Christians. What is almost totally lacking, however, is any attempt by the author to give his reader any insight into either the administrative or deliberative organization of the Council, its functioning processes, or its composition.

---

[12] Mandell Creighton, A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome, II, 266, n. 2 (London: 1895).

John does not supply us with any foreword or introduction in which he sets down his reasons for undertaking his task, nor do those who have written about John or his Historia address themselves to this problem. Still, it is worthy of some attention since, given the resources he commanded, John could have touched upon any subject he desired, and yet he failed to deal with so much that would be of interest to us. Particularly interesting is his failure to treat the processes within the deputations or the other preliminary deliberations of the Council. Since John does not tell us what purpose he intended his work to serve we can only conjecture. His consistent policy of subordinating considerations of procedure to the formal conclusions and pronouncements implies that he was attempting to record what might be called an official history of the Council, and consequently there was no need to discuss how a given decision or pronouncement was reached. The obscurity from which he came to the Council and to which he returned may well account for the reason he undertook his task. The Council of Basle was the central event of his life and career, and consequently it is not surprising that he would want to perpetuate its memory and in so doing ignore the mundanities of procedure for the sake of the great and full deeds which it accomplished.

The Historia was forgotten during the four centuries following its creation, and our knowledge of it results from the general drive for accurate and full sources which characterized the nineteenth century historiographical revolution. On June 20, 1849, at the session of the philosophisch-historische Classe of the Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Vienna, the Czech historian František Palacký proposed to the Academy the undertaking of the systematic and modern edition of materials relative to the fifteenth century church councils. It is seldom possible to explain human motivation in any situation, but in this case it seems clear that two considerations loomed large in the making of Palacký's proposal. The suggestion was made in the aftermath of the revolution of 1848, movements in which the scholars and intellectuals who composed the Imperial Academy had played a large part. Surely the reform sentiment so strong at the time found an object of empathy in the fifteenth century Fathers, who, also, had tried to change the world by proclamation, and perhaps the bond was strengthened because the Fathers, too, had failed. In their decision to undertake the project the scholars of the Academy observed that the ecclesiastical and state reform efforts of the fifteenth century were analagous to the strivings of their own time and to the then current direction of the Weltgeist. The decision concluded that the project has "the highest meaning for practical life."[13] The second consideration is by no means as lofty but probably tells us more of why the project was launched. In 1845 Palacký had published the first volume of the third part of his monumental Geschichte von Böhmen, covering the period 1378-1419, and the second volume, 1419-1431, was in preparation. This meant that Palacký had reached such a point in his researches that he was aware of the need for a systematic working of the materials for this period. The first volume of the Monumenta Conciliorum, which appeared in 1857, was edited by him and was complementary to his other studies.

Regardless of the reasons for the decision to undertake the project the Commission für die Herausgabe der Acta Concilli saeculi decimi quinti, including Palacký, Ernest Birk, Josef

---

[13] Sitzungsbericht der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, III, 58 (Vienna: 1849).

Chmel, and Theodor Georg von Karajan was established and by July 23, 1851, had prepared an ambitious schedule of publication which von Karajan reported to the Academy.[14] The first of the two volumes of which the project was to be composed was to include editions of:

1. *Initium et prosecutio concilii Basiliensis*, Johannis Stoicic de Ragusio.

2. *De reductione Bohemorum ad ecclesiae unitatem*, Johannis Stoicic Ragusio (rightly: *Quomodo Bohemi reducti sunt ad unitatem ecclesiae*).

3. *De Concilio Basiliensi*, Petri de Saaz, a Taborite (rightly: *Liber diurnis de gestis Bohemorum in concilio Basiliensi*, Petri Zatacensis).[15] These three works were to be edited by Palacky as, indeed, they were.

4. *Liber diurnis concilii Basiliensis*, Petri Bruneti. This work was to be edited by von Karajan but apparently was not. It did not appear in the *Monumenta Conciliorum*. This edition was to have been based upon Paris ms. 1497; however, the researches of Rudolph Beer proved conclusively that Paris

---

[14] *Ibid*. "Bericht des Hrn. Prof. v. Karajan als Referenten der Commission fur die Herausgabe der Acta conciliorum saeculi decimi quinti," VII, 258 (Vienna: 1851).

[15] F. M. Bartoš has recently argued that this work was not written by Petrus Zatacensis but by the Silesian Taborite, Laurence of Reichenbach. *Sborník Historický*, II, 250f.

mss. 15623/4 represented a purer, more original text,[16] and it was from this manuscript that Johannes Haller prepared his edition of Bruneti's protocols contained in volumes two, three, and four of the Concilium Basiliense.[17] (see below)

5. Liber de legationibus, Joannis Carlerii (rightly: Liber de legationibus concilii Basiliensis pro reductione Bohemorum, Aegidii Carlerii).

6. Liber de legationibus, Johannis de Turonis (rightly: Regestrum actorum in legationibus a sacro concilio in Bohemiam).

7. De Concilio Basiliensis, Thomae de Haslebach (rightly: Diarum gestorum per legatos concilii Basiliensis pro reductione Bohemorum, Thomae Ebendorferi). The preceding four items were to be edited by Ernest Birk, as, indeed, they were.

8. Johannes Stöckels Brief und Aufzeichnungen über das Basler Concil. This was to have been edited by Josef Chmel, but never appeared under his editorship. It was published, however, in the Concilium Basiliense, Vol. I, pp. 54-107, under the title Die Berichte des Ulrich Stoeckel von Tegernsee. Ulrich is the author's correct name.

---

[16] Sitzungsbericht der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, "Die Quellen fur den Liber diurnis concilii Basiliensis des Petrus Bruneti," CXXIV (Vienna : 1891).

[17] C.B., II, xii.

The second volume was to hold what von Karajan called De Concilio Basiliensi of Johannes de Segovia. This was, of course, the Historia gestorum generalis synodi basiliensis.

The rest of the Commission's report contains a discussion of the manuscripts from which the editions were to be made, an accounting of the expenditures of the Academy's funds by the project, and the registers of two codices from the Stifts-Bibliothek zu Klosterneuburg, 637A and 637B, which contained materials relative to the Council of Basle which the Commission felt the Academy should acquire. The reports of the Commission ceased to appear in the Sitzungsberichte after 1867, and the project and the Commission, which apparently continued to exist, are rarely mentioned thereafter except in conjunction with the announcement of the appearance of some part of the work.

In 1857 the first volume appeared despite a shortage of funds [18] and without two of the projected contributions, the Liber diurnis of Peter Bruneti and the reports of "Johannes" Stöckel (see above). The subsequent reports contain little except a chronic plea for funds and the promise of the early appearance of the second volume. They contain nothing about the abandonment of the delinquent portions. In 1873 the report of the secretary of the *philosophisch-historische Classe* of the Academy included the announcement of the second volume which contained only a part of the *Historia*.[19]

---

[18] Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, "Bericht über die Thätigkeit der Commission zur Herausgabe der Acta conciliorum saeculi decimi quinti während des akademisches Verwaltungsjahres 1855 auf 1856," XXIII, 593 (Vienna: 1856).

The third volume, which appeared in five parts, had a long and troubled career. The first part appeared in 1886 edited by Birk, but his death in May, 1890, marked the passing of the last of the original planners, and the editorship was transferred to Rudolph Beer who published the second, third, and fourth parts in 1892, 1895, and 1896 respectively.[20] The project remained an avowed interest of the Imperial Academy and the commission charged with its dispatch continued to be listed among the *Sonderkommissionen* of the *philosophisch-historische Classe* of the Academy until 1918 when it permanently disappeared from the reports of the Academy and from Vienna along with so much else.[21] At that, however, the Commission outlasted the word "Imperial" in the title of the Academy by a year. The project is not seen for a full decade until the fifty-third Jahresbericht of the Historische und Antiquärische Gesellschaft zu Basel, in 1928, announced that "the Chronicle of the Council of Basle by John of Segovia, the edition of which had been begun by the Viennese Academy of Sciences some time previously but not brought to completion, has been taken into our publication program by the board of directors. The preparations for the completion of the work are in progress."[22] The reasons for the transfer and the way it was carried out remain obscure, but once located in Basle the work was quickly completed. The fifth and final part of the Historia appeared in 1932 under the editorship of Karl Stehlin and Conrad Wilhelm Hieronimous.

---

[19] *Anzeiger der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, XXIII, Jahrgang, 1873 (Vienna), p. 179.

[20] *Anzeiger der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Classe*, XXVIII, Jahrgang, 1891 (Vienna: 1892), p. 104; XXXII, Jahrgang, 1895 (Vienna: 1896), p. 11.

[21] *Almanach der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, LV, Jahrgang (Vienna: 1918).

A fourth volume was published in 1935 in Basle under the auspices of the Society and contains an epilogue discussion of the manuscripts used in the edition, the critical apparatus of the whole work, and an index of the proper names mentioned in it. It was edited by Stehlin, Hieronimous, and Georg Boner. Finally the work projected by von Karajan over eighty years before was concluded, and John's Historia was complete for modern, scholarly use. The impact of the Historia and the other sources in the Monumenta Conciliorum on the historiography of the Council was felt long before its completion, however, and the appearance of the sources in volume one and the portions of the Historia in volume two mark the beginning of the modern study of the Council.

---

[22] Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde, XXVII, vii.

The protocols of the Council and the Concilium Basiliense. In 1896, the same year as the appearance of the last portion of the Historia to be edited in Vienna, the first of the eight volumes of a new source collection, the Concilium Basiliense: Quellen und Studien, was published in Basle. As the title indicates it was to include sources and monographs, but only a few studies by the founding editor, Johann Haller, were included, and these only in the first volume. The sources in the first volume included the reports of Ulrich Stöckel von Tegernsee which had been planned for inclusion in the Monumenta Conciliorum and a selection of documents which had in common only their relation to the Council of Basle and that they had not been published previously.

The next three volumes, which appeared in 1897, 1900, and 1903, were edited by Haller and presented the complete protocol of Peter Bruneti covering the Council from February, 1432 through 1436. This particular source and its later counterpart, the protocol of Jacob Hüglin, compose a remarkable source, for they are the day-to-day records of the transactions of the Council and from them emerge a microscopic view of the synod which gives a rare insight into its routine workings. The publication of this source brought into print the last item mentioned by von Karajan in his prospectus of 1851. Unfortunately the Jahresberichte of the Basler Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Altertumskunde, the sponsoring agency for the Concilium Basiliense, does not give a formal statement of purpose of the project. Haller was certainly aware of the Imperial Academy's concern over the protocol and the reports of Stöckel, but there is no indication that he considered himself the heir to von Karajan's projection.[23]

The fifth volume appeared in 1904 and held:

1. Extracts from an anonymous diary kept in Basle by a member of the Council between 1431 and 1435 and for the year 1438, edited by Gustav Beckmann;

2. Notes on the conciliar embassy of the Bishops of Lübeck, Viseu, Parma, and Lausanne to Avignon and Constantinople for the period from February, 1437, until February, 1438, edited by Beckmann;

3. A letter from Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini to Julian Cesarini, edited by Rudolph Wackernagel; and

4. The Diary of Andrea Gatari, 1433-1435, edited by Giulio Coggiola.

Volumes six, edited by Gustav Beckmann, and seven, edited by Hermann Herre, which contain the records of the

---

[23] C.B., VI, Vorwort.

Committee of Twelve, the steering committee of the Council, for the year 1437, and the protocol of Jacob Huglin for the years 1438-1443, appeared in 1926 and 1910 respectively. Volume six was delayed in publication because of a combination of circumstances which impeded the preparation of the text, which actually had been printed in 1910, and postponed the completion of the register.[24]

Volume eight appeared in 1936 and contained:

1. The records of Julian Cesarini as President of the Council, edited by Heinrich Dannenbauer;

2. A description of Basle in 1438 by Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, edited by Alfred Hartmann;

3. The stable accounts of Candinal Louis Aleman for the year 1445, edited by H. C. Wackernagel; and

4. The minutes of the conferences at Lyons and Geneva which led to the end of the Basilian schism, edited by Gabriel Perouse.

The principal contribution of the Concilium Basiliense is the careful edition of the notarial records of the Council so that a continuous account of the synod's business for the years covered is presented in the form in which it was put down for the use of the Fathers themselves. The appearance of the protocols did not simply increase the amount of information about the Council; it actually made available a new kind of information which allowed the study of the step-by-step development of programs or policies with a detail that is rare in the study of the middle ages. There can be no doubt that the publication of this material was responsible largely for the explosion of monographic studies of the Council in the decade or so following its appearance, and these monographs are the vehicles for the serious study of the Council today.

---

[24] Paul Lazarus, Das Basler Konzil: seine Berufung und Leitung, seine Gliederung und seine Behördenorganisation (Berlin: 1912), p. 18.

The works of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini. The career of this remarkable man from simple secretary to Pope, his accomplishments as poet, orator, and diplomat, and his service to Council, Emperor, and Pope (for a time, even to an Antipope) have been told often and thoroughly,[25] but his importance to the study of the Council is such that we must touch some aspects of his work here.

In addition to incidental remarks and occasional letters, Aeneas Sylvius wrote two items of importance to students of the Council: The Commentarii de gestis basiliensis councilii,[26] which covers the years 1438-39 and is but a fragment of a lost, larger work, and De rebus basiliae gestis commentarius,[27] a criticism of the Council and a discussion of the causes of its failure.

---

[25] G. Voigt, *Enea Silvio de Piccolomini, als Papst Pius II, und sein Zeitalter,* (Berlin: 1856-63), 3 vols; A. Weiss, *Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini als Papst Pius II* (Graz: 1897); W. Boulting, *Aeneas Sylvius: Orator, Man of Letters, Statesman, and Pope* (London: 1908); Ady, *Pius II, the Humanist Pope* (London: 1913); M. Birck, "*Enea Silvio de Piccolomini als Geschichtschreiber des Baseler Konzils,*" *Theologische Quartalschrift*, LXXVI, 1894.

Because of the later prominence of their author these works have exercised an influence on the historiography of the Council which is far out of proportion to their intrinsic value. Today, equipped as we are with the Historia and the protocols, Aeneas's works are more important to the understanding of his career than that of the Council. The tortuous course from the entourage of Cardinal Capranica in 1433 to his coronation as Pius II a quarter of a century later made Aeneas Sylvius subject to two sets of forces which pressed him to denigrate the Council. First, his abandonment of the Council and Felix V to seek his fortune elsewhere required his disassociation with the past and the constant demonstration of his political reliability. Second, his task as papal diplomat among the Germans, where he was charged with regaining their obedience with Rome, required again the discrediting of his former associates. In addition to these, the interests and objectives of his later career must have influenced his opinions and recollections.

---

[26] Carolus Fea, Pius II, Pontifex Maximus, a calumniis vindicatus, (Roma: 1824).

[27] R. Wolkan, Briefwechsel des Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Fontes rerum austriacarum, LXVII.

Until the publication of the other sources in the last century, however, what was known of the Council was generally known from Aeneas Sylvius, and any task of synthesizing the views and interpretations of the Council on almost any point requires some effort to reconcile the conclusions which have been drawn from Aeneas Sylvius with those drawn from other sources.[28] The studies based on Aeneas Sylvius generally present the Fathers of the Council as radical, opportunistic riff-raff and their proposals as aberrant, extreme, and destructive to the health of the Church. The picture of the Fathers which emerges from the other sources is gentler in portraying their characters and ambitions. As we will see later, even the abuse of the Council is more easily explained in terms of institutional conflict than cynical personal careerism.

Giovanni Domenico Mansi and the Sacrorum conciliorum nova, et amplissima collectio. Born of a patrician family in Lucca in 1692, Mansi entered the Church at the age of sixteen when he joined the Congregation of Regular Clerics of the Mother of God where he gained his education in historical studies, having found theology and dogmatics, the more proper disciplines for one of his Order, too stilted and scholastic for his taste.[29] Mansi's first important adventure in print was the edition of the Annales of Baronius and Raynaldus at Lucca between 1725 and 1756.[30] About the time he completed the last volume of the Annales he allowed himself to be convinced by some friends that his talents could best serve the Church by his collaboration with them on an edition of the Encyclopédie that would cleanse it of its venom and render it safe for all to use. The first and last volume of the effort, which appeared in 1758, so distressed Clement XIII that not only was Mansi reprimanded personally by the pontiff, but the General of his Order was instructed to supervise more closely the workings of his subordinates. Although Mansi's reputation for piety and devotion to the Church saved him from professional destruction the incident denied him the cardinal's hat for which he had been slated.[31] Mansi did not live out the rest of his life in ignominy, however, and though he was denied membership in the Sacred College, Clement XIII rewarded his work in 1765 by elevating him to the archiepiscopal chair of his native city where he died in 1769.[32]

---

[28] See below; R. Zwölfer, "Die Reform der Kirchenverfassung auf dem Konzil zu Basel," _Basler Zeitschrift fur Geschichte und Altertumskunde_, XXIX, 24.

---

[29] R.-P. Henri Quentin, Jean-Dominique Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires (Paris: 1900), 59.

[30] Ibid., 62.

[31] Ibid., 79.

The interlude with the Encyclopédie was an interruption in the progress of Mansi's most noted work, the Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio. This work, which was begun in 1748 and occupied the rest of his life, was a thirty-one volume collection of documents relative to the Church councils from the earliest times through the Councils of Basle and Florence. The Basilian materials are found in volumes XXIX, XXX, and XXXI and were published posthumously in Venice in 1788, 1791, and 1798 respectively. The amplissima collectio represents the last in a long tradition of conciliar collections in which each was superimposed on the preceding and reaching back to the first quarter of the sixteenth century. Quentin accurately presents the situation when he says:

> It is impossible to appreciate justly the last work [Mansi's] if one has not first discussed the work of his predecessors. Mansi contains a reprinting of Coleti with augmentation just as Coleti has reprinted Labbe. Labbe, in his turn, incorporated into his collection all the work of Bini, as Bini made use of Surius who likewise reproduced Crabbe, as Crabbe reproduced the first of [them] all, Jacques Merlin, Canon of Paris.[33]

Each of these successive collectors made their contribution to the tradition, and the complex development of the whole is fully and skillfully traced by Quentin.

---

[32] Ibid., 60.

[33] Ibid., 6ff.

The Basilian materials are among the last prepared by Mansi and, unfortunately, are exemplary of the hurry and carelessness which mark all of his work. The most glaring weakness of the collection is the absence of any meaningful system of arrangement or cross indexing which would allow the researcher to use the work quickly and conveniently. The arrangement of documents is the result of the collection's heritage from its predecessors, a heritage discussed fully by Quentin, and the haphazard arrangement of the documents added by Mansi himself. Mansi apparently laid down the documents as he came to them with no concern for grouping or planned arrangement. The difficulty of use is compounded by the absence of any index or table of contents, the only guide to the thousands of documents being the presence in each volume of a title register of the documents in that volume. The titles themselves are usually meaningless and often misleading.

There are three basic types of sources in the volumes: the acts and decrees of the Council which are conveniently arranged chronologically in Volume XXIX; documents relative to the organization and internal functioning of the Council which are scattered throughout the three volumes; and correspondence from, to, and concerning the Council which are also scattered at random in the volumes. Although the work is of inestimable importance and value the student must always be grateful for what is to be found rather than disappointed in what is absent.

II. THE STUDY OF THE SOURCES

Until the latter part of the last century there were few works to which the student could turn for information about the Council, and the generally hostile works of Aeneas Sylvius were the ruling source.

The first attempt that might be called modern in the study of the Council was Jacques Lenfant's _Histoire de la guerre des Hussites et du Concile de Basle_ which was published in two volumes in Amsterdam in 1731.

Jacques Lenfant was born at Bazoches in Beausse on April 13, 1661, the son of a protestant minister. He was trained for the ministry and took the pulpit of the French Church in Berlin in 1689 where he remained until his death in 1728.[34] Most of the more than thirty works which Lenfant wrote dealt with theological topics, but his interests included church history, especially that of the fifteenth century, and he produced several works on the councils, of which the Histoire discussed here was his last.[35]

---

[34] Anonymous, "Memoire historique de la vie, de la mort et des ouvrages de feu Mr. Lenfant," _Histoire de la guerre des Hussites et du Concile de Basle_, xi ff.

The treatment of the Council of Basle in this work is subordinate to Lenfant's consideration of the Hussites. Indeed, the Council does not even enter the narrative until the beginning of the second volume, and then the only facet presented is the negotiation with the Bohemians. One cannot speak of Lenfant's Histoire embodying any particular interpretation of the Council beyond his view of it as primarily convoked to deal with the Hussites. There is no discussion of the conciliar tradition or of considerations occupying the Fathers other than the Hussite question. The sources upon which Lenfant based his study, a list of which is provided in the introduction to the work, are mostly obscure authorities stemming from the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries, and only occasionally does the modern scholar recognize a name or title such as Aeneas Sylvius, Baronius, or Panormitanus.

The comprehensive studies. There is to this day no general treatment of the Council of Basle which the student can use as a comprehensive guide, but there are a number of basic works on subjects so intimately connected with the Council that they are of inestimable value for its study. The three most important of these are the Histoire des Conciles by Karl-Josef Hefele and Dom Henri Leclercq, The History of the Papacy

---

[35] Ibid., ix f.

from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome by Mandell Creighton, and Noel Valois's *Le Pape et le Concile* (1418-1450), all of which we must treat individually.

1. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*. This work might be looked upon as a companion to Mansi's *amplissima collectio* since it presents the work of all the major Councils from the earliest times through Ferrara-Florence. The first volume of Karl-Josef Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte* was published in Freiburg in 1855 and the seventh and last volume, which deals with the fifteenth century Councils, was published in two parts, the first devoted to Constance and Siena in 1869 and the second, with its treatment of Basle and Ferrara Florence, in 1874. In 1907 the first volume of a French translation of the second German edition "corrected and augmented by critical and bibliographical notes" was published in Paris as the *Histoire des Conciles*, the work of "*un religieux Benedictin de l'Abbaye Saint-Michael de Farnborough*," who was identified in later volumes as Dom Henri Leclercq. The translation of both parts of volume seven appeared in Paris in 1916. It is this translation which is generally used today, and it is usually cited as Hefele-Leclercq.

The main effort of the work is to present the decrees of the Councils with a brief explanation of their background and historical context. The work is an invaluable reference for the precise decisions of the Councils and for discussion of the Councils' salient events, but it is primarily an annotated and comprehensive register of decrees.

2. Mandell Creighton, History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome. The only attempt at a comprehensive treatment of the Council in English is in the latter part of volume two and the early chapters of volume three of this work. The treatment of the Council is often lively and interesting, but it is subordinate to the development of the Papacy which is the author's main concern.

Creighton's principal sources for the study of the Council were the portions of John of Segovia's Historia available at the time[36] and the various works of Aeneas Sylvius. Remarkably little use was made of Mansi.

The work is valuable for its treatment of the Council from beginning to end even if the narrative is broken up with lengthy digressions from the events of Basle to present unrelated events in Italy or elsewhere. Needless to say, these are digressions only from our point of view, and Creighton is always faithful to his basic purpose which is the recounting of the history of the Papacy.

---

[36] This work was originally published under the grossly erroneous title History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation, volume II of which appeared in 1882 and Volume III in 1887. Volume III of the new edition under the new title appeared in 1897. I have been unable to establish when the new edition of volume II appeared, but presumably it was before 1897. Creighton tells us, II, 377 f., that he had access only to volumes I and II of the Monumenta Conciliorum.

3. Noel Valois's Le Pape et le Concile (1418-1450).[37] This work contains the best and most systematic treatment of the Council. Like Creighton, Valois is concerned with the Council in its role as antagonist to the Papacy, and his primary task is the recounting of the course of their controversy; but the breadth of scene in which he has conceived his work is sufficient to allow a full presentation of the activities of the Council and the machinations around it.

The work from our point of view shares a weakness with the other two, and that is the failure to present the forces at work within the Council. All of these works deal with the Council as if it were a singular, unitary block, and they show little regard for the forces converging within it to determine its role in the general European scene. This failure stems, of course, from the fact that they are not studies of the Council of Basle but are devoted to related topics--the role of the synod in the history of the Church, the course of the Papacy, or the course of the struggle between conciliarism and the doctrine of papal monarchy--in which the Council is but one of the forces at play. There is no study which considers the Council as a focus of the events of its period. That consideration must be developed through the many monographic studies on individual aspects of the Council.

---

[37] Paris, 1909.

The monographic studies of the Council. It is difficult to generalize about the large body of studies devoted to aspects and details of the Council. The bibliography which accompanies this study will show the variety of their topics while their examination will reveal the range of their length and quality. They can be divided roughly into three categories: those which deal with events or conditions within the Council, those concerned with the influence of some policy or action of the Council on something outside the Council, and those devoted to the study of events or conditions outside the Council which somehow affected the course of the Council. The studies in the first category are based directly on the editions of the Historia of John of Segovia and the protocols to the virtual exclusion of other sources. The works in the latter categories, while using these sources considerably, depend upon other specific source collections or archives and are as important as contributions to the history of their particular topic--be it a geographical area, a religious order, or whatever--as they are to the Council. The works in all three categories, however, reflect a more intimate awareness of the workings and the forces within the Council than do the studies of Hefele, Creighton, or Valois. The study of the Council in every respect must proceed through the study of these monographs, and its understanding will have to be a synthesis of their disparate contributions. It is not possible at this time to prepare a comprehensive view of the

Council from them because there are still many problems of the Council which require careful and independent study. Some of these problems are isolated in the pages below, and it is the primary purpose of this study to solve one of them--the problem of the nature of the membership of the Council.

III. THE CONSIDERATION OF THE PROBLEM OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE STUDY OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE

The problem of the membership of the Council has been distinguished by its failure to attract any significant interest. The comprehensive studies either ignore it completely, as in Hefele-Leclercq, or treat it briefly with generalized remarks drawn usually from Aeneas Sylvius's derogation of the Fathers.

Noel Valois's generally excellent *Le Pape et le Concile* is the only major work on the Council to include any lengthy consideration of the personnel composition. Considerations of the subject by Valois, filling some five pages, are found at the beginning of his discussion of the period of peace between Pope and Council entitled "La Treve entre le Pape et le Concile (1434-1435)."[38] The tone of these remarks implicitly suggests that they are intended for the Council as a whole. Valois cites the voting record of December 5, 1436, which deals with the selection of a site for talks with the Greeks, as recorded by Aeneas Sylvius in De rebus Basiliae gestis, as the basis for his discussion of national representation. He finds that Aeneas Sylvius lists 109 French, 100 Germans or Hungarians, slightly more than 50 Italians, and about 10 Spaniards in attendance. Two things are curious in this. First, why did Valois take his figures from Aeneas Sylvius when the notarial record of this vote is given in Haller's edition of the protocol of Peter Bruneti (Bruneti is quoted on the following page)? There are discrepancies between the two counts, albeit minor, and it would seem that the official record of the Council would be more reliable. Second, why would Valois present the Council as it existed in the last month of 1436 in a general discussion of the situation two years earlier?

---

[38] I, 311-15.

The drawing of data from late 1436 for a chapter on the period 1434-35 is a more important fault since it is blatantly erroneous. Valois would not assume that the diplomatic situation in Europe in late 1436 could be used to describe the situation one or two years earlier, nor would he take the posture of the papacy in its dealings with the Council in 1436 as indicative of the situation in 1434. Why, then, did Valois take attendance figures for late 1436 and put them in a context suggesting they applied to an earlier period if not for the Council as a whole? This is an expression of the attitude of Valois toward the problem of the composition of the Council. He was vaguely aware that the Fathers had to be someone and come from somewhere, but he was not particularly concerned with establishing who or where.

Valois's remarks about the geographic or national distribution of the Council's members are not his only remarks on the composition of the Council. He goes on to show that the Council, through its administrative and deliberative structures, allowed the lower clergy to dominate. He paints a frightening picture of the "influence of the prelates annihilated by the members of the lower clergy,"[39] and goes on to suggest that the discussion of the most exalted issues of ecclesiastical affairs was conducted by clerical vagabonds "who, in the evening, took off their long robes to serve tables or to dispatch domestic duties."[40] This picture of the Fathers is drawn, with one exception, from questionable sources: Aeneas Sylvius, the validity of whose observations on this subject is discussed below, or Cecconi's collection on the Council of Florence.[41] The only source cited for the lowly nature of the Fathers, which is from a man who was there and was not antagonistic to the Council, is a passage from John of Segovia complaining that a conciliar decision was made without the presence of any prelate or theologian. It is impossible, because of the vagueness of John's description of the incident, to verify from the protocols that this did in fact happen, and an examination of the incorporation roster makes the literal truth of this hard to believe.[42]

---

[39] Ibid., 313.

[40] Ibid.

[41] E. Cecconi, Studi Storici sul concilio de Firenze, (Florence: 1869).

Mandell Creighton's _A History of the Papacy_ . . . gives us two remarks about the composition of the Council worth pausing over and considering. The first, under the rubric "Results of the democratic organization of the Council," observes:

> The constitution (i.e., membership) of the Council was shifting from week to week. Only those were pemanent who had some personal interest to gain, or who were strong partisans. The enemies of Eugenius IV clung to the Council as the justification of their past conduct as well as of their hope in the future. Adventurers who had everything to gain, and little to lose, flocked to Basel and cast in their lot with the Council as affording them a better chance of promotion than did the Curia. Thus the Council became more and more democratic and revolutionary in its tendencies. The prelates drew to the side of Cesarini, and found themselves more and more in a minority, opposed to a majority which was bent on the entire humiliation of the Papacy.[43]

Never were the arrivals in sufficient numbers to conjure the image of "flocks" of clerics descending on the city, and changes in the membership are hard to discern even by months, much less by weeks.

The truth of this statement, which is more indicative of the Victorian Bishop of London's social views than it is of the nature of the Council, is warranted by a reference to Aeneas Sylvius which says: "Among the bishops and other incorporated fathers, we see in Basle cooks and stable hands adjudicating the affairs of the world."

---

[42] _De magna auctoritate episcoporum_, _C.B._, I, 40.

[43] _Ibid_, 276-77.

In Creighton's consideration of the Council's membership we encounter the attribution of a menial condition to the Fathers just as we did in the observations of Valois which were based also on Aeneas Sylvius's impressionistic remarks. We have here a remarkable exercise in historiography. An aspect of an event in the fifteenth century is commented upon by a biased contemporary, and these comments are used by a nineteenth century author to bolster an opinion still presented to and honored by twentieth century readers. Thus is the knowledge of human affairs secured for posterity. It is a tenuous process at best, and one which seldom bears scrutiny well, but perhaps a close scrutiny of this particular incident in the process will help us to understand the present state of the problem with which we are concerned.

In the first place, it is impossible to tell from Creighton's remarks what period of the Council he is referring to, but from the general context it would seem that the passage is meant to sum up the whole of the Council. An examination of Aeneas Sylvius's remarks which Creighton uses for documentation shows they are equally lacking in any indication of the time period to which they are intended to apply, but, again, it would seem that they were intended for the entire Council. At least Creighton, unlike Valois, respects the intention of his source without transporting the force of the remarks upon which he would base his own from the time of their intended reference to one that fits his own scheme more suitably. Still, a consideration of the source itself causes wonder, first, because of its questionable veracity and, second, because it is curious that this particular passage would attract the eye of a scholar truly concerned with the personnel composition of the Council.

The statement is from a famous speech made by Aeneas Slyvius before the Emperor[44] in an attempt to gain imperial support for the Papacy. Aeneas Sylvius's loyalties had only recently been transferred to the Papacy following his long association with and participation in the very Council he condemned. This record of association on the part of the papal envoy would blunt the point of the most elegant Ciceronian oration unless the orator could break the association, and the usual and most effective way of showing a chastened and repentant attitude toward an erring past is to denounce the associates of that past.

The mere facts that a statement is made by a person who has reason to lie, that the allegations are beneficial to the maker and in a form which might help him, do not mean that the statement is untrue, but they make one wonder. The question is: Is it true that a considerable number of members worked their way through the Council by grooming horses, doing kitchen work, or, to harken back to the passage from Valois, by waiting on tables?

---

[44] Carolus Fea, Pius II, Pontifex Maximus, a calumniis vindicatus (Rome: 1824).

A certain number of Fathers were incorporated into the Council as "familiares" of various dignitaries and this term might well designate someone accustomed to ignoble labor, but it might just as well refer to a member of a personal chancery. In addition to these there are numbers of Fathers who are mere names in the incorporation records, and they may have been dedicated sufficiently to the conciliar ideal or the pursuit of some advancement in their fortune to seek menial service. This writer, however, knows of no case where one of these unknowns distinguished himself in the deliberations of the Council. By and large an examination of the incorporation records shows that relatively few Fathers were incorporated who did not have a living provided.

The second of Creighton's remarks to be considered here is his description of the circumstances in which the menial element came to dominate the vote of December 5, 1436, about the site of the talks with the Greeks, the record of which was so important in the interpretation of the composition of the

Council by Valois. The selection of Avignon as the site, we are told, resulted from the unethical acts of a menial minority which was determined to have its own way and took measures to out-vote its opponents. It summoned the priests from the neighborhood and flooded the Council with its own creatures.[45] The incorporation list of the Fathers does not show this influx nor does the voting roster reveal a single parish priest from the diocese of Basle. The justification for this statement rests upon two sources, John of Palomar, who says:

> Those who went through the streets in short raiment were served at the tables of the lords [presumably prelates of the minority, Avignonese party] and having donned long robes, entered and thus the number of those changing sides was augmented.

and Eugene IV, in a letter to the Duke of Savoy:

> Many votes were got to come to the Council, daily, by various means because of this affair [the election].

As in the earlier passage, the reason for Creighton's assumption that these were dependable sources of information is puzzling since Palomar was one of the Fathers to desert the Council because of the way the vote went, and Eugene IV was struggling with the Fathers over the very point voted on. The background of the balloting is not to be assumed from the remarks, after the fact, of the losers of the election.

The incorporation records and the protocols in general cast doubt on the literal truth of these passages from the sources, and it is reasonable to think that the remarks by Palomar and Eugene are simply routine crabbing over a lost election. Aeneas Sylvius's earlier attribution of a menial condition to a number of the Fathers is probably just his elegant way of saying "I really didn't like it there." The question of why Creighton and Valois would feel that these various sentiments were worth picking up and handing on still remains and is the more puzzling since it clashes so dramatically with the precision and excellence of their scholarship in general.

---

[45] Creighton, II, 297.

The answer to this question would seem to be that the nature of the Council's membership was not important enough in the minds of our authors for exhaustive and systematic investigation, yet it called for some statement of definition and clarification. The fact that the sources for the statements seem to apply only loosely to the sentiments expressed encourages us to conclude that the sentiments were formed before the sources were found. Hence, the rigid criticism of sources we would expect would not seem necessary to the authors. One seldom questions a source that bears out an unquestioned conviction and when the issue is ancillary to the work at hand the drive to investigate is diminished even more.

The failure to investigate the problem of conciliar membership is understandable when one understands the roles of the Council in the two works. We have already observed that Valois and Creighton were not writing histories of the Council of Basle. Valois's purpose was to "throw new light"[46] on "the religious crisis of the fifteenth century." His very title, "Pope and Council, 1418-1450," sums up his topic--it is the struggle of Rome, "the old capital of the Roman world, colored by the blood of the martyrs, where the debris of pagan temples had been made into venerated sanctuaries"[47] "to safeguard itself against the principal of conciliar supremacy."[48] Creighton's aim was to write a history of the period which saw "the decline of papal monarchy over Western Europe."[49] Nowhere in his statement of purpose[50] does he claim to be studying conciliarism or the Councils, and, indeed, he is not. In this work the councils are but products of one of the "schemes of reform which consequently agitated Christendom" after "the abasement of the Papacy by the Great Schism of the fifteenth century."[51] In the work of Valois, then, the Council is but the enemy camp in his description of a struggle; in that of Creighton it is simply an agitation. The repeated characterization of the Fathers as selfish and churlish by

---

[46] Valois, I, xxix.

[47] Ibid., 311.

[48] Ibid., 91.

[49] Creighton, I, 3.

[50] Ibid., 3f.

[51] Ibid., 4.

Aeneas Sylvius was sufficient explanation for their antagonism in the struggle.

As aspects of the Council other than its struggle with Rome have been studied, however, this simple view of the Council's membership has proven inadequate. Johann Haller's study of the reform efforts of the Council does not suggest that its members were merely self-serving careerists, and he cannot accept the struggle of the Council with the Pope as a contest of personalities vying for power within the structure of the Church. The force of the reform effort of Basle suggests that the struggle is a conflict of institutions in which the Pope and Curia are the champions of the older, universal power of the Church while the Council is the agency of the newer, specific nation states and the Fathers are the agents of their princes.[52] This latter view of the conflict between Pope and Council suggests an entirely different view of the motivations and the nature of its participants--a nature hardly reconcilable with the view of Aeneas Sylvius. The direct study of the membership as a topic in its own right is a superior approach to the establishment of its nature than is reasoning backward to what it must have been from one's view of the nature of the Council.

The importance of the establishment of the precise composition of the Council's membership has been succinctly stated by Hubert Jedin who says that our understanding of the significance and ambit of various decrees such as Sacrosancta and Frequens and of the very nature of these Councils, especially of Basle, depends on a clear understanding of their differences from the more papally centered and directed councils of the High Middle Ages. Jedin goes on to say that a very important factor in our understanding of Constance and Basle is to be found in the character of their membership and national origins of their members.[53]

---

[52] The point is presented in detail below, Chapter IV, pp. 119ff.

Jedin's discussion of the Council of Basle in his little handbook, Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church: An Historical Outline[54] illustrates his concern with this problem. Although the discussion is limited to a short five pages, the problem of the nature of the membership is the leading consideration, a sharp contrast with the treatment which the problem received in the earlier works.

This interest in the membership of the Council is not limited to Jedin, for recently Paul Ourliac has presented two considerations of the sociologie du Concile de Bâle,"[55] the first in an article demonstrating the pan-European nature of the Council, and the second in his treatment of the Council as a whole in a general history of the Church in this period. His treatment of the membership is in the general tradition stemming from Aeneas Sylvius, complete with the table-waiting story and some new denigrating material from a letter of Piero da Monte.[56]

---

[53] Bischöfliches Konzil oder Kirchenparlament? Ein Beitrag zur Ekklesiologie der Konzilien von Konstanz und Basel, (Basel: 1963). This was originally an address delivered before the Aeneas Silvius Stiftung of the University of Basle on November 9, 1962.

[54] New York, 1961.

Ourliac's effort is puzzling and disappointing. It is puzzling because of the apparent contradiction between the interest he shows in the problem of the conciliar membership and the methods he utilizes in studying it. After defining the Council as a "social body which deserves to be studied in its spirit as well as its structure,"[57] he proceeds to this study with almost no regard to the prime source of information about the membership--the incorporation records; with no thought of the possibility of variations in the "sociologie" of the membership during the nearly two decades of the Council's existence; and with a willingness to attribute to the Council the most serious improprieties without the slightest substantiation.

---

[55] "Sociologie du Concile de Bâle," Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, LVI, 1; Histoire de L'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours, XXIV; L'Eglise au temps du Grand Schisme et de la crise conciliaire (1378-1449), (Paris: 1962). The treatment of the Council of Basle is in part two, chapters II-V.

[56] Paul Ourliac, L'Eglise au temps du Grand Schisme et de la crise conciliaire, 239.

[57] Ibid., 238.

Ourliac bases his analysis of the membership on the testimony of contemporaries who were hostile to the Council. We are told, for instance, that "all the testimony agrees"[58] that a significant number of the Fathers supported themselves through menial labor. The only specific reference, however, is made to an unidentified source in the Deutsche Reichstagsakten which says:

> Where the other councils were wont to be celebrated by mitred prelates, in this Council not only cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and abbots entered, but also priors, archpriests, archdeacons, and other clerics and even servants and all sorts of men of insignificant condition who wished to enter.[59]

This statement illustrates only a profound ingnorance of the medieval Church Council. From the time of Innocent III the Church in council had included others than "mitred prelates," and certainly the spirit of conciliarism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries would lead one to expect broadly based councils reaching well below the level of mitred dignity.[60] The most important aspect of this remark is not in its value in this regard but in Ourliac's use of it. He need not have searched out a quotation alleging the heterogeneous nature of the Council's membership; had he but examined the incorporation records in the protocols he could have demonstrated it. The constant juxtaposition of evidence about the Council's membership from disparate times illustrates our second criticism.

---

[58] Ibid., 239, n. 10. [59] Ibid., 239.

[60] See below, pp. 56ff.

The propriety, and perhaps the legitimacy, of the Council are questioned when Ourliac asserts blatantly and without substantiation that "many of the proctors could present mandates the regularity of which were very doubtful."[61] Our knowledge of the Council will be incomplete until a careful study of the role and use of proctorship is done, but as yet no one knows the regularity or irregularity of its use. There is certainly much discussion of the regularity of proctorial mandates in the incorporation records, but Ourliac would lead us to believe that this was for nought and that significant numbers of improperly licensed men were accepted by the Fathers. Ourliac again fails to substantiate an essential point when he states that an inflation of the numbers of the Fathers, presumably through the accretion of members of insignificant condition, "was produced in 1433 when the two parties sought to increase their voting strengths."[62] This statement passes my understanding. My study of the Council does not reveal the presence of parties competing for votes in 1433.[63] The year 1433 was a time of unparalleled unity and concord among the Fathers as they worked together to gain papal recognition for the Council. Furthermore, this was the time when the adherence of the upper clergy to the Council of Basle was fully as strong as it had been to the Council of Constance.

---

[61] Ourliac, p. 239.

[62] Ibid.

This study of the Council's membership is disappointing because it evinces that the membership warrants study and promises to proceed to that task. The promise is not fulfilled. Ourliac simply amplifies the remarks of Aeneas Sylvius with no attempt to bring to bear the evidence of the incorporation records or any other source which might present a new perspective and therefore add to our understanding of the Council.

Three remarkable little studies of painstaking detail illustrate the concern for the establishment of the precise nature of the Council's membership. J. H. Burn's _Scottish Churchmen and the Council of Basle_[64] presents brief biographical notes on the sixty-four Scots for whom we can establish a definite and direct connection with the Council of Basle and the details of those connections. This does not mean that all were incorporated, for it includes those who referred some case to the Council for adjudication, accepted a provision from Felix V, or had any other contact with the synod. This gives us an insight of rare precision into the relations of the Scots with the Council, but it shows little about the Council since Scotland was not among the more important nations involved with it.

---

[63] This remark is suggestive of a number of allegations about the Council during 1436-37 when the Council was split over the issue of negotiating with the Greeks. See below, Chapter IV, pp. 133ff.

[64] Glasgow, 1962.

The earliest systematic studies of any aspect of the membership of the Council are the companion works of Heinrich Stutt, _Die nordwestdeutschen Diözesen und das Baseler Konzil in den Jahren 1431-1441_,[65] and Conrad Hanna, _Die sudwestdeutschen Diözesen und das Baseler Konzil in den Jahren 1431 bis 1441_.[66] These are dissertations of identical format and outline done at the University of Erlangen under the direction of Professor Bernard Schmeidler and Privatdozent Helmut Weigel. The works present statistical tables by years of the incorporated members and the non-incorporated visitors to the Council and the source and nature of all appeals to the Council from their respective areas. There are also lists of members and visitors with brief descriptions of their activities at the Council and discussions of the impact within the dioceses of the various actions of Pope, Council, Emperor, Electors, etc., which affected their relations with the Council. There is a single problem which mars the works of Stutt, Hanna, and to a lesser degree, Burns. Although the three works are exhaustive in their use of the sources and in their presentation of data, there is a general failure to relate the data to the historiography of the Council. There is virtually no interpretation nor analysis of the information they contain, and no attempt is made to explain how that information complements, contradicts, or alters the ruling views about the Council. These works are convenient check lists of persons from the areas treated who were attendant at Basle, and are invaluable references because they contain a remarkable amount of information about the Fathers which is from local and specialized archives.

---

[65] Erlangen, 1928.

[66] Borna-Leipzig, 1929.

IV. THIS STUDY

The purpose of this study is to establish who came to the Council, whence they came, and when they arrived. By establishing these it will be possible to conclude something about the forces which attracted them to the Council and from this we can gain a clearer insight into some aspects of what the Council was to its participants and what they intended for it or hoped to accomplish through it.

This study is possible because of the survival of the protocols or notarial records of the Council kept by Peter Bruneti and Jacob Hüglin for most of its span and the existence of epitomized accounts of the protocols in the Historia of John of Segovia for the entirety of the Council's meaningful life. The right to participate in the Council was open to all clerics, regardless of rank, if they were willing to go through the formal incorporation ceremony which was held frequently as a part of the general congregations of the Council. Since it was the duty of the conciliar notaries to record all that transpired in these congregations, the listing of the newly incorporated members was done as a regular matter of form.

The presentation of the study. This study will consider the membership of the Council in six chronological periods which subdivide the eighteen year span of the Council according to the different considerations dominating the Council at various times. The periods are: February, 1431 - February, 1432; March, 1432 - January, 1434 (23 months); February, 1434 - September, 1437 (44 months); October, 1437 - June, 1439 (21 months); July, 1439 - July, 1440 (13 months); and August, 1440 - August, 1443. (Although the Council continued on until April, 1449, our records of the incorporations of new members stop in August, 1443.) The first and sixth periods are but prologue and epilogue to the Council because of the scant attendance, absence of direction, and general impotence which characterized the Council during them. The meaningful part of the Council's history extended from February, 1432, through July, 1440, and the term "Council" as used here refers to this period unless the contrary is specifically stated. The justifications for the selection of these particular periods for the study of the Council are presented in the chapters devoted to them, and their limits and spans are given here only by way of introduction.

Although this study will consider the membership of the Council separately for the various periods, much of what will be discussed is meaningful only when the various data are compared with homologous data from the other periods and these comparisons must be numerical. Consequently, it is necessary, when comparing the numbers from period to period, to use some device that will compensate for the differing timespans of the periods. It is meaningless, for example, to observe that 606 Fathers of known geographical origin were incorporated in the third period and 462 in the second if it is not also realized that period three embraced 44 months while period two lasted but 23. The device used for the compensation of the time factor is the reduction of the gross figures to numerical indices where necessary. The indices are derived in the following manner: First, the percentage of the timespan of the Council that is embraced by each period is calculated. We see, then, that the third period accounts for 43.56 per cent of the total while the second period embraces only 22.77 per cent. The second step is to calculate what percentage of the arrivals of a given category arrived in the period under examination. Since 1,788 Fathers of known geographical origin arrived during the Council we can establish that 33.5 per cent and 25.9 per cent of these arrived in the third and second periods respectively. The third and final step in the calculation of the indices is to divide the percentage of the timespan represented by the period into the percentage of arrivals, or, in the case of our example, 33.5% ÷ 43.56% and 25.9% ÷ 22.77%. These two divisions give us indices for the third and second periods respectively of .76 and 1.13. We now know that Fathers of known geographical origin appeared at the Council in greater number *in proportion to the timespan* in the second period than in the third, and that they did so in a proportion of 113:76.

This cumbersome device will be used as sparingly as possible, but it is the simplest and quickest manner by which we can express the relationships of the arrivals of given categories of Fathers between the various periods.

The problems preventing the establishment of the size of the Council. In looking at the figures for each month and studying them collectively or in the selected periods it is necessary to remember that our figures deal with *arrivals*, not *attendance*. It would be easy to assume that the patterns suggested by the former held true for the latter, and there is no indication that this is not the case, yet there is no surety that it is. One of the early governing ordinances of the Council was that no Father was to leave the environs of the Council without the permission of the Council, and we know of cases when these permits were applied for and issued, but since so many Fathers appear prominently in the records of the Council for a while and then disappear forever with no record of their departure, it would seem that most ignored the requirement to seek a formal dismissal before departure. Had the members of the synod but abided by their rules all would have been well and we would have a record of departures as well as arrivals and thus be able to establish the composition at any given time, but such is not the case.

Some insight into the size of the Council at specific moments can be gained from the sources. We know that in June, 1433, a number of votes were taken in the _deputatio pro communibus_, one of the four deliberative divisions of the Council. Since the membership was distributed evenly among the deputations and we know the total number of votes cast in the one, we can multiply by four and estimate the size of the whole. The votes were:

June 10	70[67]	(x 4)	280
June 13	70[68]		280

---

[67] _C.B._, II, 425.

[68] _Ibid._, 428.

June 17	62[69]	248
June 23	54[70]	216
June 30	50[71]	200

Two votes the following October show:

October 3	46[72]	184
October 27	39[73]	156

It is unfortunate that the practice of reporting the voting did not continue for perhaps from it the size of the Council could be determined.

Another insight into the size of the Council might be gained from the reports in the minutes of the number of "prelates" present on certain occasions. There is no way of knowing who a "prelate" might have been,[74] though certainly

---

[69] Ibid., 433.

[70] Ibid., 437.

[71] Ibid., 441.

[72] Ibid., 493.

[73] Ibid., 511.

[74] C. D. Du Cange, Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis (Paris: 1678), expanded by L. Favre Niort, 1883-87, 10 vols., defines "praelatus" in general as one who presided over others and settled their disputes. He gives as a synonym "episcopus." Specifically the word is presented in contexts showing a wide range of meanings and many examples of its use which defy any specific meaning. J. F. Niermeyer, Mediae latinitatis lexicon minor (Leiden: 1954), gives examples of the word which denote a person in a position of power, bishop, ecclesiastic of lesser rank than a bishop, especially archdeacon, head of a religious house, a lesser regular, a collegiate dean, the patron of a parish church, and a generalized complimentary or honorific meaning.

The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: 1908-1914) discusses the term only as it has been used in its strict, ecclesiastical sense which was defined in the seventeenth century. This cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and abbots must have qualified for the title. On other occasions we are told that a certain number of mitres were visible. The figures from some of these references are:

January 8, 1433	Procession	49 mitres[75]
January 22, 1433	Public Session	46 prelates[76]
December 12, 1433	Assisting at Mass	42 prelates[77]

The vote on December 5, 1436, which was to establish the place where the Council would meet with the Greeks for talks aimed at achieving unity of the two communions, is one of the two cases in the entire Council where we are given an actual listing of all of the members at any one time. The total

---

definition restricts its use to specific hierarchical offices (the members of the episcopacy, abbots, provosts, collegiate deans), who are called "real prelates," and to certain curial offices.

In the records of the Council of Basle, the word seems to have no specific connotation. The word appears repeatedly in the letters urging attendance which the Council sent out in the early months of 1432 (see below, page 73), but always in such a context as to suggest a generalized reference to ranking churchmen. A curious use of the word which illustrates its lack of a clear definition is found in the record of the incorporation of Johannes Colcach (*C.B.*, II, 203), who was incorporated "*pro episcopo, prelatisque, et clero*" of the city of Hildesheim. This implies that the term applies to those beneath the dignity of the bishop but above that of the general clergy.

[75] *C.B.*, II, 308.

[76] *Ibid.*, 322.

[77] *Ibid.*, 508.

listed at that time was 350, fifty of whom were cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, or abbots.[78] The other occasion when the members were listed was at the time of the initial division of the Council into deputations in February, 1432, when there were only sixty-one members present, including six bishops and eight abbots.[79]

The meaning of these figures is obscure. It is hardly safe to assume that the ratio of 1 to 7 which is found between "prelates" and the rest of the Fathers in the vote of December 5, 1436, was a constant for the entire Council or that these ranks alone were the "prelates" mentioned elsewhere. The listing of the number of mitres is likewise vague. Does the term "mitre" mean the literal number of ceremonial headdresses present, which gives us the intriguing picture of the conciliar notaries counting the hats of their betters to while away the hours of ecclesiastical ceremony, or is it simply a figure of speech meaning bishop or other mitred prelate? In any event this is about the sum of data indicating the total membership of the Council.

The aim of this study is not to establish the size of the Council at every moment of its existence, but to gain what insight is possible into the nature of its composition from the arrival figures.

---

[78] _Ibid_., VI, 448.

[79] _Ibid_, II, 46 ff.

The limitations of this study. Before attempting to understand the meaning of the patterns formed by the arrivals of the Fathers at the Council, the precise nature of the figures which form these patterns must be understood. The difficulties of establishing the precise composition and size of the Council at a given moment are discussed above. An even more serious problem is that we do not know the proportional numbers of clergy serving in the various geographic areas defined in this study but this does not mean that nothing can be gained from a study of the incorporation records.

The problem of who, abstractly, should compose a general council is also difficult to establish. The views of Marsilius of Padua, which held the Church to be the congregatio fidelium and the hierarchy to be a human invention, laid a basis for the determination of ecclesiastical affairs through general councils. These councils would be composed of all the faithful, including the laity,[80] or, more practically, their delegates.[81] The precise method for selecting the delegates

---

[80] Victor Martin, "Comment S'Est Formée la Doctrine de la Superiorité du Concile sur le Pape," Revue des Sciences Religieuses, XVII, 122-143, 261-289, 405-427, p. 266. Laymen were not incorporated into the Council of Basle nor is there any record of a layman addressing the Council. Aeneas Sylvius relates that the Emperor worked through clerical intermediaries to get his thoughts before the Council. In Creighton's A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome, II (London: 1895), 266. J. N. Figgis, Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius: 1415-1625 (New York: 1960; reprint), 52, 59, is of the opinion that laymen were accepted by the Council.

[81] Martin, 268.

is not explained except that all the segments of the Christian community were to be represented. A generation earlier, John of Paris had made a similar proposal: that "the best governance of the Church" would be attained "if, under a single Pope, many [persons] would be chosen by and from each province so that everyone would have his part in the governance of the Church."[82]

The crisis of the Great Schism encouraged the further development of the conciliar idea.[83] One of the principal contributors in this effort was Conrad of Gelnhausen who felt the Church's problems could be solved by a general council which would be a rightly convened gathering of the representatives of the various ranks, orders, and persons of all Christendom. These representatives would gather for the purpose of treating the affairs "concerning the common good of the universal Church."[84] The likeminded and contemporary Henry of Langenstein defined a general council as a "congregation in which various persons bearing the authority and power to act for the various parts of all Christianity are rightly convened for treating [affairs] concerning the common good."[85]

---

[82] Albert Hauck, "Die Rezeption und Umbildung der allgemeinen Synode im Mittelalter," Historische Vierteljahrschrift, X, 465 ff., 468.

[83] Franz Bliemetzrieder, Das Generalkonzil im grossen abendländischen Schisma (Paderborn: 1904).

[84] Hauck, 465.

[85] Ibid.

These writers are among the first rank of those who transmitted and developed one tradition of the conciliar idea. There is nothing in their writings which could suggest a precise scheme for the selection of the individuals who should rightly compose a Council. It is clear that this tradition held that the body of believers should be represented in all its various parts, but these parts are not specifically enumerated, and the sole stated criterion for acceptance into a general Council was but a true faith.

Albert Hauck has convincingly argued that the conciliar theory is rooted not so much in the ideas of Marsilius, Henry, and Conrad as they are in the ecclesiological ideas of "the greatest Pope of the Middle Ages," Innocent III.[86] His views dictated that the Church in Council would not be merely the bishops, as in the early Councils at Nicaea, etc., but would include the heads of the various lands, ranks, orders, and all the constituent corporations of the great corporation, the Church.[87] Brian Tierney has taken this idea and placed it in a much broader context in which the influence of canonist thought on the general subject of the governance of corporations is shown to be of the greatest importance in the development of the conciliar idea which came to fruition at

---

[86] _Ibid_., 470.

[87] _Ibid_., 471.

Constance and Basle.[88] But Tierney observes that "one does not, however, encounter in the works of the Decretists any theoretical analysis of the concept of representation. . ."[89]

Neither of these traditions supplied the Fathers of Constance, and later those of Basle, with a clear guide to whom they should include among their numbers. In practice, the Council of Basle seems to have accepted any cleric who presented himself.

This lack of clarity in portraying the intended personnel poses a problem since it makes it impossible to compare the patterns formed by the arrivals at the Council with any abstraction of what the membership should have been. Such a comparison would add a sense of completeness to this work which it must lack. It should be emphasized that this lack of any ideal scheme of the composition of the Council is not so much a failure of our knowledge about the Council of Basle and the conciliar ideal in general as it is the reflection of the lack of any clearly defined concept on the part of the Fathers and the conciliarists themselves.

Our ignorance of medieval demography and the distribution of the clergy throughout Latin Christendom makes it impossible to analyze the arrival figures for the Council in terms of the proportional representation they afforded for the various areas of Europe, with one fortunate exception. The works of P. Pius Boniface Gams, Series Episcoporum,[90] and Conrad Eubel, Hierarchia Catholica,[91] present a complete list of the dioceses and archiepiscopal provinces for the catholic world at the time of the Council and thus enable us to study the episcopal attendance at the Council in terms of its comparison with the totality of the catholic episcopacy.

---

[88] *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory: The Contribution of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism*, (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1955).

[89] *Ibid.*, 47ff.

All of these problems do not mean that it is impossible to gain some insight about the nature of various segments of the body of clerics which did constitute the Council, for it is possible to study the order in which members of various groups came to the Council, and from this to come to some conclusions about the issues which were most attractive to the men who composed that particular group. We do not know if the sixty-five clerics who composed the delegation from the province of Bourges constituted a larger or smaller percentage of the total clergy within the province than did the sixty-five clerics incorporated from Tarragona, but we do know that the delegations, while being of the same size, were attracted to the Council at different times.[92]

---

[90] Ratispon, 1873. [91] Münster, 1914.

[92] These figures are taken from Appendix I, Chart II.

	Bourges	Tarragona
Period II	16	0
Period III	29	15
Period IV	14	38
Period V	6	12

It is obvious from these patterns that the forces attracting delegates from Bourges were not efficacious in drawing clerics from Tarragona, and the differences warrant study.

CHAPTER II

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE

I. THE ORIGINS

"It is absolutely necessary to convene the Council for the coming March . . ." "Every Christian is obligated . . . to procure the opening of the Council on pain of mortal sin." "If the Pope or the Cardinals refuse to work for the celebration of the Council, or if they impede it, or if they do not attend it, the Council will be bound to proceed to their deposition."[1] Thus did "two Christian Princes" advertise their feelings about Councils and Popes by posting placards with this message throughout Rome on November 8, 1430.[2]

The idea of the necessary council which could depose Popes was created out of latent strains in theological and canonistic thought of the middle ages by desperate men who were forced to seek some way out of the scandal of the Great

---

[1] Paul Lazarus, _Das Basler Konzil_. _Seine Berufung und Leitung, seine Gliederung und seine Behördenorganisation_ (Berlin: 1912); Valois, I, 88f; John of Ragusa, _Initium et prosecutio concilii basiliensis_; _M.C._, I, 65f; John of Segovia, L. I. c. III; _M.C._, II, 4f.

[2] Valois, I, 89, says that the Princes were probably Federick of Brandenburg and his son, Louis of Brieg. Albert of Austria was also rumored to be one of the Princes. If he was, it is interesting to wonder what he thought of this action after 1438 when he, as Emperor, was forced to steer a course between the Council and the Pope it had deposed.

Schism. The failure of conciliation added strength to those who wished a general council to right the Church in this critical time. By 1414 the situation was sufficiently hopeless and conciliar thought sufficiently developed to allow the Emperor Sigismund, with the cooperation of one claimant, John XXIII, to call a general council in Constance in November.[3] For the first time in seven hundred years a gathering of clerics had been summoned by one other than the Pope to adjudicate the affairs of the universal Church. The false start of conciliarism in Pisa five years earlier had been a gathering of prelates directly involved in running the Church,[4] but this gathering at Constance summoned, in theory, all the faithful and, in fact, sought the widest possible base for its deliberations and conclusions. The breadth of base and the aegis of the Emperor guaranteed that the Council would not take a narrow view of its charge and that the secular divisions of Europe would be recognized. The Council looked not only to the specific problems of the schism and its solution but it went on to what it held as the kindred concerns of heresy and the general need for reform in the Church.

---

[3] Creighton, I, 289f.

[4] Ibid., 228ff; M. Stuhr, Die Organisation und Geschäftsordnung des Pisaner und Konstanzer Konzils (Berlin: 1891), 9f.

The problem of heresy was the one most easily agreed upon and was the first to be addressed. In Bohemia an indigenous tradition of ecclesiastical experimentation had been joined by imported Wyclifism, and a popular discontent with the existing Church was threatening to turn into revolution. Processions went through the streets of Prague carrying placards depicting the corruption of the Roman Church and condemning its most established practices.[5] The most celebrated leader of this troublesome faction was Master John Hus of Prague. Even before the Council convened, the Emperor Sigismund urged Hus to argue his views before it, and Hus, eager to popularize his position and the Bohemian situation generally, accepted the Emperor's offer of a safe conduct and arrived in Constance even before the Council's opening.[6]

Hus was not heard at Constance, and it is surprising that he could have thought he would be. Bohemia was represented by men who were his antagonists at home, and at Constance he came to look upon them as his bitterest foes.[7] His

---

[5] H. Kaminsky, D. L. Bilderback, and others, "Master Nicholas of Dresden, The Old Color and the New: Selected Works Contrasting the Primitive Church and the Roman Church," Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, LV, Pt. I, 9ff.

[6] František Palacký, Geschichte von Böhmen, III, 7 (Prague: 1854).

[7] Creighton, II, 26.

Wyclifism marked him as much more dangerous than a mere aberrant thinker, for the Englishman's ecclesiology brought the whole basis of civil governance and order under question. In September, 1414, John Gerson, in a letter to the Archbishop of Prague, said of Hus that his "most dangerous error, destructive of all political order and quiet, is this--that one predestined to damnation or living in mortal sin, has no rule, jurisdiction, or power over others in a Christian people. Against such an error it seems to my humility that all power, spiritual and temporal, ought to rise and exterminate it by fire and sword rather than by curious reasoning."[8]

Hus was seized and imprisoned on the authority of John XXIII and the Cardinals on November 28, 1414, as a suspected heretic. His situation grew more hopeless as the process against him ground on. Wyclif's writings were ordered burnt and his memory condemned in May, 1415.[9] If this were not enough to guarantee Hus's death the reports of a spreading revolt against ecclesiastical authority in Bohemia were.[10] In June Hus was heard by the Council repeatedly, but the audiences were little more than opportunities to recant, and he was condemned and burnt on July 6, 1415.[11]

---

[8] František Palacký, Documenta M. Joannis Hus (Prague: 1869), quoted in Creighton, II, 27; Howard Kaminsky, "Wyclifism as Ideology of Revolution," Church History, XXXII, 1, March, 1963, has shown that ideologically Gerson's concern was well founded.

[9] Creighton, II, 28, 34.

[10] *Ibid.*, 35.

The righteousness and certain zeal with which Hus was condemned is curious in a group whose credentials were as novel and uncertain as those of the Fathers of Constance. Mandell Creighton suggests that "Hus was made a victim of the need felt by a revolutionary party for some opportunity of defining the limits of its revolutionary zeal."[12] Perhaps the killing of Hus is even more easily explained by the desire of the Fathers to forge themselves into a unit by some quick, drastic, and popular act. In any event, the Council could now turn its attention to its other concerns.

The problems of curing the schism and reforming the Church could not be solved as easily as that of heresy. To cure the schism the papacy had to be vacated, or at least it had to be recognized as vacant by the preponderance of Europe, and with three claimants this was bound to take some time. John XXIII, the creature of Pisa, became less and less enthusiastic about the Council as it became clearer and clearer that it was not going to confirm him in office, and on March 20, 1415, he fled Constance to save his tiara. He was quickly captured, and on May 29th he was deposed.[13] The Roman Pope, Gregory XII, agreed to resign and recognize the Council in July, 1415,[14] but Benedict XIII, in Avignon, proved recalcitrant, and his position had to be destroyed by the alienation of his support which proved to be a relatively slow process. The Council did not feel itself sufficiently established to proceed with the business of electing a Pope until July 26, 1417, when it deposed Benedict *in absentia*.[15]

---

[11] Ibid., 38ff, 48f. Palacký, Geschichte von Böhmen, III: 1, 322ff.

[12] Creighton, II, 33.

The vacation of the Holy See allowed the Council to address its two remaining problems, the selection of a new Pope and the reform of the Church, but these two matters became intertwined. The Fathers most dedicated to reform realized the value to their cause of a vacant Papacy and wished to prolong the vacancy until the reform work was done. The element in the Council with the greatest stake in the existent system, an element including a score of cardinals, pushed for the filling of the pontifical throne at once with the very reasonable argument that this was the prime reason for the gathering.[16] The Cardinals had their way and on November 11, 1417, the Council elected Oddo Colonna, a Cardinal of Gregory XII, as Pope, and he was crowned as Martin V ten days later.[17]

---

[13] Creighton, I, 326ff.

[14] Creighton, II, 59.

[15] *Ibid.*, 82ff.

[16] *Ibid.*, 91ff.

[17] *Ibid.*, 100ff.

With a strong man on the curial party enthroned as Supreme Pontiff and his position strengthened by the relief and momentary good will attendant to the healing of the Schism, there was little hope of any sweeping reform. The matters of Papal prerogative in filling offices, legal jurisdiction, and finances were mulled over, but nothing of substance was decided.[18] The Council dissolved itself on April 22, 1418.[19]

A contributory factor to the limited success of the Council in the field of reform was its organization by nations for purposes of deliberation. The existence at Constance of the nations--Italian, Spanish, French, German, and English--was at once the healthy recognition of the political and social realities of fifteenth century Europe and an index of the university influence in conciliarism.[20] Their effect was to divide the Council into five separate units, the approval of each being required for conciliar action. The discussion and dissemination of views, the exchange of information, and the clarification of objectives which would have come from a freer organization were hampered by this scheme. The organization by nations also heightened national animosities while the jealousies of the churchmen for their autonomy from the state kept the Council from serving as an instrument for the conciliation of problems among nations or the adjustment of the ecclesiastical structure to the realities of the newly-rising political order with its many highly centralized and articulated states.[21]

---

[18] *Ibid.*, 120ff. [19] *Ibid.*, 115.

[20] E. DeLaurelle, E. R. Labande, and Paul Ourliac, *Histoire de L'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, XIV, *L'Eglise au temps du Grand Schisme et de la Crise Conciliarire* (1378-1449) Paris: 1962., 173f. L. Siebeking, *Organisation und Geschäftsordnung des Kostnitzer Konzils*, (Leipsig: 1872).

One item which was agreed upon was contained in the decree _Frequens_ of the thirty-ninth session (October 9, 1419). It included a provision for periodic councils to be called by the Pope as a duty of his office, which, once convened, would exist separately from him and superior to him. The first was to be five years from the closing of Constance, the second, seven years from the closing of the first, and then every ten years, reckoned from the closing of each successive council, for eternity.[22] On April 19, 1418, three days before the closing of the Council, Martin designated Pavia as the site for the next Council.[23]

Many had hopes that not only was the crisis of the Church solved but the preconditions of that crisis had been erased by _Frequens_, but on May 10th an ominous thing happened.

---

[21] _Ibid_. Creighton, II, 126.

[22] G. Mansi, _Sacrorum conciliorum nova, et amplissima collectio_ (Venice) XXVII, 1159ff.

[23] K. J. Hefele and H. Leclercq, _Histoire des Conciles_ (Paris: 1916).

Martin V, in a public consistory dealing with a matter of little consequence, issued a bull which cited the appropriate canons and contained the statement: "It is not allowable for a person to appeal from the supreme judge, that is to say, the Holy See, the Roman Pontiff, Vicar of Christ, nor to disagree with his judgment in a matter of faith."[24] The unquieting aspect of this matter did not go unnoticed, but the Council was closed, the Fathers had dispersed, and it was five years till they were to gather again.[25]

The Council of Pavia was duly opened on April 23, 1423, but local political difficulties made it desirable to translate it to Siena. This was done on the pretext of plague, one of the few reasons justified by Frequens for the papal translation of a Council, and the proceedings were reconvened at Siena on July 2nd. After seven desultory months the Fathers, who were almost all Italians, did the one thing worth mentioning: on February 19, 1424, they appointed Basle as the site of the next Council. On March 7, 1424, they adjourned.[26]

This, then, was the background from which emerged the stern message of the "two Christian Princes" and from which came the Council of Basle.

---

[24] Valois, I, xxii f.

[25] Ibid.

[26] H-L, VII:1, 610ff.

II. THE OPENING

(PERIOD I: FEBRUARY, 1431 - FEBRUARY, 1432)

The call and the organization. The effect of the placards has been forgotten, but regardless of what it might have been Martin V, on February 1, 1431, did appoint Julian Cesarini, Cardinal-deacon of St. Angelo, as papal legate to and president of the Council of Basle.[27] Cesarini was held in high regard in diplomatic and curial circles as a man of ability and integrity. A Roman by birth, he had had much experience in Germany, and it was this experience which had led Martin, in the preceding month, to designate him as the legate to the anti-Hussite crusade to be mounted in the Summer.[28] The death of Martin V on February 20th and the elevation of Gabriel Condulmieri to the Papacy as Eugene IV on March 3rd did not interrupt the preparations for the crusade or the Council since one of Eugene's first acts was to confirm Cesarini in both appointments.[29]

In April, a month after the literal provisions of Frequens required the opening of the Council, Cesarini designated

---

[27] Valois, I, 90.

[28] Robert C. Jenkins, The Last Crusader: or, The Life and Times of Cardinal Julian of the House of Cesarini (London: 1861); H. Fechner, Giuliano Cesarini (1398-1444) bis zu seiner Ankunft in Basel an 9 Sept. 1431 (Marburg: 1907); P. Becker, Giuliano Cesarini (Kallmunz: 1935).

[29] Valois, I, 100.

John of Ragusa as his representative at Basle to explain his own absorption in the Crusade and to beg the indulgence of the assembled Fathers.[30] Actually there was hardly anyone in Basle for the occasion. Although the earliest arrivals had been present since late February, several factors had coalesced to depress the numbers in attendance. The absence of the papal legate and president must have detracted from the Council's prestige and attractiveness; hostilities between the Dukes of Burgundy and Austria made the countryside around Basle unsafe for travel, and this discouraged many; and, finally, the preparations for the Crusade into Bohemia preoccupied the Germans and kept them at home. Even with these discouragements, however, it is necessary to admit a profound lack of interest in the Council if one is to understand the really remarkable absence of participants.

Despite the continuing lack of Fathers the Council was opened formally on July 23rd with John of Ragusa and John Palomar, both avid conciliarists from the University of Paris, representing Cesarini. The formal opening made little difference save that the letter of Frequens had been observed and the real beginning of the Council was with the arrival of Cesarini on September 9th fresh from the defeat of his crusade at Domažlice (Tauss).

---

[30] John of Ragusa, Initium et prosecutio. . ., M.C., I, 73.

When Cesarini had sent his apologies to the Council for his absence in April, he had pointed out that the crusade would be the agent of the Council's mandate to extirpate heresy. The defeat at Domažlice convinced the Cardinal that the deliberations of the Council now would have to gain the settlement that arms could not. Cesarini threw his whole energy into arranging honorable negotiations with the heretics, and on October 10th a formal invitation to come to Basle was sent to them.

Shortly before the invitation was issued to the Bohemians the French prelate Jean Beaupère had been sent to Rome in an attempt to secure the help of the Pope in gaining a stronger attendance for the Council.[31] This embassy was a part of a general campaign by the Council to increase its scant numbers. Other aspects of the campaign included attemps to end the hostilities between Burgundy and Austria, the issuance of specific invitations to leading prelates, and formal entreaties to particular princes to use their influence on behalf of the Council.[32] It is impossible to judge the importance of these efforts in bringing about the increased attendance in the later months, but they must have been more efficacious than the mission of Jean Beaupère. When Eugene heard the report of the Council's emissary he took the problems of the Council as sufficient reason or pretext for its dissolution.[33] On November 12th a papal bull was issued instructing Cesarini to dissolve the Council and to announce that another one would be held in Bologna in eighteen months.[34] Shortly after the issuance of this bull, word reached Rome of the Council's proposed negotiations with the Bohemians, and this new intelligence further hardened Eugene's position. On December 18th Eugene issued a bull which included the negotiations with the other reasons and peremptorily dissolved the Council without going through Cesarini.[35] The Council, ignorant of the papal interdict, had held its first public session on December 14th.[36]

---

[31] Valois, I, 118. John of Ragusa, Initium et prosecutio. . . ., M. C., I, 117.

[32] The following communications from the Council are gathered in Mansi, XXX: Letter to Frederick, Duke of Austria, urging peace with Burgundy, date omitted, 69; Letter to Duke of Burgundy from the Emperor Sigismund on behalf of the Council urging peace with Austria, October 30, 1431, 70; Letter to the Bishops of Germany ordering their attendance at Basle, October 7, 1431, 65; Letter to the King of France

---

urging his participation in the Council and requesting him to urge French prelates to attend, date omitted, 65; Letter to the Bishop of Noyon inviting him to attend the Council, date omitted, 61. Following this item Mansi says, "Under the same form, except for a few words, I find in the manuscript codex of the Royal College of Navarre a letter to other bishops sent by the Council, dated 23 January." Presumably the year was 1432.

[33] Valois, I, 119ff. John of Segovia, L. II. c. III, M.C., II, 68.

[34] John of Segovia, L. II. c. III, M.C., II. 67.

[35] *Ibid.*, 72.

[36] John of Segovia, L. I. c. XXVI, M.C., II, 47; Mansi, XXIX, 3ff.

The papal messenger, Daniel de Rampi, Bishop of Parenzo, arrived in Basle on December 23rd with the bull of dissolution in hand.[37] The Bishop did not publish the bull, but rumors of his purpose spread and Council members and townsmen protested. Parenzo left Basle on January 8, 1432, and on January 13th his second, John of Prato, attempted to present the bull to the Council. The Fathers refused to listen, fled the meeting, and ordered John and his documents taken into custody.[38]

The reaction of the Fathers to the attempted dissolution was confused at first, but upon reflection they decided to stand firm on Frequens, and on February 8th the Council set itself to the creation of its deliberative and administrative apparatus.[39] The Fathers made two important changes from the organizational structure of Constance: membership in the Council of Basle, with full voting rights,[40] was extended to the lower clergy, and the division of the Council into nations was abandoned.

---

[37] John of Segovia, L. II. c. II, M.C. II, 64; Concilium Basiliense; II, 24ff. Valois, I, 129ff. There is some obscurity as to which bull Parenzo had in hand when he arrived in Basle and which one was published on January 13th. Valois, I, 131f, says definitely that it was the bull of November 12th in both cases since he worked for the dissolution through Cesarini which he need not have done had he carried the bull of December 18th. It would have been difficult, but not impossible, for the later bull to have reached Basle in only six days, but it is hard to imagine that it had not arrived before January 13th. The letter of Cesarini written in response to the publication of January 13th (see below) seems to answer only the earlier bull.

[38] Valois, I, 133.

[39] John of Segovia, L. II. c. XXI, M.C. II, 126.

The extension of full membership to the lower clergy seems to have had no special significance at the time it was decided except as a sincere attempt to gain the broadest possible base for the consideration of the Church's problems and perhaps as a reflection of the Council's desire to increase its membership in order to weaken Eugene's basis for dissolution. If this latter consideration was in the minds of the Fathers it proved pointless since the lower clergy did not come to Basle in this or the succeeding period.[41] Little was made of the matter at the time, though it was to prove of the greatest significance in the later years of the Council.

---

[40] At Constance any cleric could be a "participant" as could secular princes, but only Cardinals, Archbishops, bishops, and abbots could vote. At Pisa the vote was given to the Doctors and Masters. See Lazarus, 30ff and Stuhr, 25ff. At Basle all members of the Council could vote, but secular figures were barred from membership except through a clerical proctor in which case the proctor voted as a cleric rather than as the agent of a lay principal. See Lazarus, 28ff.

At Constance and Siena simple attendance was sufficient for membership, but at Basle, after February 8, 1432, membership came only through an oath of incorporation which bound the members to the authority and decisions of the Council. The oath was administered before the Council in the general congregations, usually on Friday. It was duly solemn and reminiscent of the oath of homage complete with a new man kneeling before the President and placing his hands within those of the President. When the press of business was great, this ceremony was conducted before the deputatio pro communibus. Clerics who were eligible for incorporation might attend the general congregations, but laymen, even the Emperor, were excluded from all aspects of the Council except as spectators at public sessions. See Lazarus, 47.

The abandonment of national organization was simply an attempt to avoid the problems it had entailed at Constance. The Fathers of Basle accepted the proposal which John of Ragusa made on February 8, 1432, to divide themselves into four *deputationes,* one each for the three charges of the Council, reform, peace, and faith, that is, the problems of heresy and the Eastern Schism, and the fourth devoted to matters "common and necessary to the Council."[42] A given deputation was not the autonomous voice of the Council on its designated subject since any action or decision of a deputation had to be supported by a two-thirds vote of at least two other deputations and approved by a two-thirds vote of the whole Council.[43] The real aim of this organizational scheme was not to create committees of specialists but to divide the time-consuming preliminary considerations of any matter among the members of the Council and thereby spread the work while avoiding any situation which might encourage the development of cliques or blocs that might come to dominate. The assignment of Council members to a given deputation was done with the aim of maintaining an even balance of ranks and nations among the four; and the composition of the deputations was always the clearest possible reflection of the composition of the Council.[44] Liaison among the deputations, assignment of new members, and routine matters were in the hands of a committee of twelve (domini duodecim) which was composed of three members from each deputation who held staggered terms of one month and with the provision that an individual could succeed himself but once.[45]

---

[41] Appendix II, Section IV.

[42] John of Segovia, L. II. c. XXI, *M.C.* II, 126f.

[43] Lazarus, 122.

In order to discourage alliances and friendships within the deputations from distracting individual loyalties from the Council as a whole a careful plan of meetings was arranged. The deputations met on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday of each week where the work was divided between the matter of special concern to the deputation and the consideration of the suggestions on matters from the other deputations.

---

[44] In the original distribution of members among the deputations, common affairs received 2 bishops, 1 cardinal, 4 abbots; faith received 1 bishop, 3 abbots, 1 prior, and 3 masters; reform received 1 bishop, 3 abbots, 2 priors, 1 episcopal vicar, and 1 collegiate dean; and peace received 1 bishop, 1 episcopal proctor, 2 abbots, and 2 collegiate deans. John of Segovia, L. II. c. XXI, 126.

[45] Lazarus, 114.

Monday, Wednesday, and Friday were occupied by "general congregations" or meetings of the whole membership. Here the proposals of the various deputations which had been approved by the requisite votes in other deputations were finally adopted, by two-thirds vote, as the will of the Council. Publication of decrees was made in irregular, solemn Public Sessions.[46] Through this system the individual Father was constantly reminded that above all he was a member of the Council and that the totality of its concerns were his. It appears that the system worked well for there are no complaints against it, either within or without the Council, and it endured for the life of the Council.

The organization of the Council was a positive act in demonstration of the Council's decision to endure and complemented well its declaration of autonomy and defiance which was published in its second session (February 15, 1432).[47]

The membership. The most obvious characteristic of the Council's membership in this period is the scant numbers composing it. The systematic listing of the arrivals begins only with the formal organization of the Council, but a seemingly full account of its affairs existed from the arrival of the first Father, Alexander, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery at Vezelay, in February, 1431.[48] This record shows only eighty-nine persons active in the Council through February, 1432, of whom thirty-five are not mentioned until the last month. The distribution of the Fathers among the four newly created deputations on February 8, 1432, revealed that there were sixty-one clerics present.[49]

---

[46] Ibid., 101ff.

[47] John of Segovia, L. II. c. XX, M.C. II, 129ff; Mansi, 21ff.

Nothing peculiar is suggested in the pattern of origins afforded by the seventy-five Fathers whose origins we know for the period.[50]

There were eight bishops and twelve episcopal proctors, twelve abbots and one abbatial proctor, nine priors, six collegiate deans, four canons, and no parish clerks among the Fathers. The remaining clerics were of miscellaneous offices such as university representatives, etc.

This distribution of the ranks indicates that the few men who were the Council in this period were of substantial position within the Church, and it was they who resolved to continue its work. With this resolution the Council went on to enjoy a remarkable growth in the next period.

---

[48] C.B. II, 1 f.

[49] John of Segovia, L. II. c. XXI, M.C. II, 126.

[50] Of the 89 persons mentioned in the protocols as being active in the Council, it is possible to assign 75 to a definite geographical area. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of Fathers from each area exclusive of those first mentioned in February, 1432. The distribution is: Salzburg, 11 (2); Besancon, 10 (7); Mainz, N. 10 (6); Sens 8 (8); Trier, 6 (4); Lyons, 5 (4); Reims, 4 (0); Rouen, 4 (3); Cologne, 3 (1); Vienna, 2 (1); Mainz, S., 2 (2) Milan, 2 (1);

Bremen, 1 (1); Italy, 1 (1); Tarentaise, 1 (1); Bourdeaux, 1 (0); Bourges, 1 (0); Toledo, 1 (0); Magdeburg, 1 (0); Gran, 1 (0).

CHAPTER III

THE HUSSITE NEGOTIATIONS AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PAPAL RECOGNITION

(PERIOD II: MARCH, 1432-JANUARY, 1434)

The success of the Council now depended upon the solution of two equally important but variously demanding problems. The negotiations with the Hussites, which united the intricacies of diplomatic negotiations with the prolix subtlety of scholastic disputation, required active, creative efforts to resolve the many political and theological issues which composed the Hussite problem. The struggle to regain the recognition of Eugene IV for the Council demanded that the Fathers play a more passive role. Once they had declared their allegiance to the principles of Constance and had exhorted the faithful to give them support and attendance they could only wait for circumstances to force Eugene's recognition.

These two problems, while distinct, had a definite and close relationship. The Council had to have papal recognition if its decisions were to have meaning, and this recognition had to admit the Council's sovereign nature. If the Council were sovereign it must have the power to set its own course for the solution of the problems of the Church. Eugene IV had denied this power by attempting to dissolve the Council because it had entered into honorable negotiations with the Hussite heretics, and the Fathers challenged this denial by continuing them. If the Council were to deserve the freedom of action it claimed for itself it had to be able to prosecute successfully the undertakings it selected. The success of the Council in reducing the Hussites was not only important in its own right, but it was essential in proving the ability of the Council to use the powers it claimed. E. F. Jacob sums up the situation by saying that Eugene's actions had the "effect of concentrating all attention upon the matter of the Bohemians, and a successful outcome of the negotiations became essential . . . to the existence of the Council."[1]

I. THE HUSSITE NEGOTIATIONS

The letters of the Council inviting the Hussites to come and speak before it were sent on October 15, 1431, and arrived in Prague[2] in early December. Since there were no formal lines of communication between the Council and the Bohemians, three copies of the invitation were sent, one through the Emperor Sigismund, another through the city of Nuremberg, and the third through the city of Cheb. All three arrived in Prague.[3]

---

[1] E. F. Jacob, "The Bohemians at the Council of Basel, 1433," Prague Essays, R. W. Seton-Watson, ed., (Oxford: 1949), 83.

[2] Palacky, 16f; John of Ragusa, Initium et prosecutio . . ., M.C. I, 135.

The invitation had assured the Bohemians of the Fathers' earnest desires for peace and understanding and had guaranteed the safe conduct of the Bohemian embassy to and from the Council. The Bohemians, perhaps remembering the promise to Hus a generation earlier, were slow to accept. They wanted to be sure that the Council would recognize their status as equals in the negotiations and that they would not be treated as supplicants. They wanted surety that their utraquist rite would be tolerated and provided for. Finally, they wanted to be sure that they would have the fullest opportunity to present, argue, and defend their views. Preliminary talks at Cheb provided the necessary assurances for the Bohemians. It was agreed that they would argue their tenets, the Four Articles of Prague, before the Council, that the Council would rebut, and that a full and fair exchange would be heard.[4] The agreed wording of the Articles was:

> 1. That the most divine sacrament of Our Lord's Body and blood should be administered by the ministers of the Church to the faithful.
>
> 2. That the word of God should be freely, publicly, and truthfully preached by those whose concern it is to do so.

---

[3] Palacký, 17; John of Ragusa, Tractatus de reductione Bohemorum, M.C. I, 137f.

[4] Jacob, 83.

> 3. That civil dominion, like a deadly poison, shall be taken away from the clergy.
>
> 4. That public and more notable sins be suppressed through the exercise of the lawful power over faithful people.[5]

The Council formally agreed to the Bohemian conditions by issuing a suitably worded safe conduct in its fourth session (June 20, 1432).[6]

The arrival of the Hussites on January 4, 1433, started a series of discussions and exchanges of embassies which would occupy the Council to the virtual exclusion of all other matters for the whole year. The early days of the Hussites at Basle were taken up with the courtesies of arrival, getting settled, and establishing the details of conduct which would allow both parties to live and work comfortably within the rules agreed upon at Cheb.[7]

The main purpose of the embassy was to present and debate the Four Articles, and this was begun on January 16th. The Hussites consumed ten days with their presentation which, with feast days, was concluded on January 28th. Their antagonists began the replies on January 31st and continued until February 28th. The last phase of the debate, the

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] John of Ragusa, Tractatus, M.C. I, 268f; John of Segovia, L. III c. XXI, M.C. II, 197f.

[7] Jacob, 90ff; Palacký, 63ff.

Hussite counter-replies, lasted from March until Holy Week, and on the Tuesday following Easter, April 14th, the Bohemian embassy departed.[8] The debates and discussions at Basle did not change anyone's mind about the truths of the faith, but a start had been made toward honorable negotiation, and an embassy of the Council accompanied the Hussites back to Prague to continue the work.

The Hussite embassy and the representatives of the Council arrived at Prague on May 8th, but the hostility of the New Town delayed the issuance of appropriate safe conducts and therefore the formal entrance of the Council's ambassadors into the city until June 9th.[9] The specific issue which the ambassadors had come to settle was the basis upon which the negotiations were to continue. The Council felt that the debates over the Four Articles had fulfilled the agreement drawn up at Cheb and that further conciliation should be done within the framework of the Council with the Bohemians incorporated as members.[10] John of Palomar presented this plan to the Bohemian Diet on June 13th, and the Diet responded that, while eager for peace, the Bohemians were determined to observe the Four Articles and therefore solicited a statement of the Council's views on them. This led to a request from the Council's ambassadors for an exact statement of the Articles upon which to base their answer to the Diet's questions. This reasonable request brought into the open the various interpretations and emphases placed on the tenets by the various Bohemian factions and revealed the divisions within Bohemia to the ambassadors.[11] The most valuable product of this embassy was the discovery that, while there was much sentiment for peace in Bohemia, the Hussites were afflicted with deep and probably irreconcilable differences among themselves. The ambassadors did find a basis upon which the negotiations could continue--the Bohemians agreed to unite with the Council and obey "according to God's will." The Council's embassy left Prague with this agreement and their new intelligence in mid-July.[12]

---

[8] The course of the debates and the gist of the arguments is given in Jacob, 92ff.

[9] Jacob, 118.

[10] *Ibid.*, 119.

The report of the agreement with the Diet and the revelation of conditions among the Bohemians were brought to Basle with the return of the embassy, which was accompanied by a three-man Bohemian delegation, on August 2, 1433.[13] The Council immediately appointed a twenty-four man committee, drawn equally from each deputation, to study the matter. The report of John of Palomar about the differences among the Hussites influenced the Fathers to pursue a policy which would strengthen the position of the more tractable Utraquists against the Taborites and Orphans and let the development of affairs within Bohemia arrange the circumstances for a settlement.[14] This policy led the Fathers to be receptive to the agreements reached by the Diet and their embassy, but there were objections to the wording of the Articles and disagreement over the order in which they should be considered. This confusion necessitated a second embassy to Prague which achieved agreement on the disputed issues from the Diet on November 30th.[15]

---

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

The Hussite problem was not settled as far as the Council was concerned, and in the Hussite lands the supporters of the settlement set about to gain its acceptance and enforcement. This brought the opponents of the plan--the Taborites and the Orphans--into open and armed resistance which culminated in their defeat at the battle of Lipany on May 30, 1434.[16] With Bohemia and Moravia now dominated by men who were determined to settle, it was relatively easy to gain the spiritual and secular integration of these lands and peoples into the Christian community. This process was completed by a tripartite conference of Hussite leaders, the Emperor Sigismund, and the representatives of the Church at Jihlava (Iglau) on July 5, 1436.[17]

The success of the Council, in 1433, in achieving the preconditions for the settlement showed it was equal to the task it had chosen for itself, and this success was instrumental in forcing Eugene's recognition.

---

[14] Ibid., 120

[15] Ibid., 121f.

[16] Ibid., 122.

[17] Ibid., 123.

II. THE STRUGGLE FOR PAPAL RECOGNITION

The Fathers received the revelation of the papal bull of dissolution on January 13, 1432, with outrage and surprise. Cesarini responded on the very day of the publication with a letter "of great length" to Eugene which held two basic points.

He argued for the need of the Council on the grounds that it was the only path left for dealing with the Hussites, that it was needed for the reform of the Church in those parts, and that its dissolution would precipitate an anti-clerical and anti-ecclesiastical reaction which would heighten the Church's difficulties. He then went on to assure Eugene that the Council had only the health and good interests of the Church and Holy See at heart.[18] The letter was followed by another on January 23rd reporting that word had been received that the Bohemians were interested in negotiation, and yet another, undated but seemingly from about the same time, emphasizing again the degree of anti-papal feeling among the Germans.[19] These letters are the first and last attempts on the part of the Council or any of the Fathers to gain papal acceptance through argument or explanation. The pronouncements issued by the Council in its second Session on February 15, 1432, clearly revealed that the Fathers held themselves above argument and explanation and independent of any earthly authority.[20]

---

[18] John of Segovia, L. II c. XV, M.C. II, 95ff.

[19] *Ibid.*, M.C. II, 107ff.

Cesarini's ambivalent loyalties to Pope and Council had forced him to resign the presidency on February 8th, a week before the second Public Session, but allowed him to remain in the Council as a member. The Fathers elected Philbert, Bishop of Coutances, to replace him.[21]

The papal bull of dissolution and the conciliar decrees of the second Public Session drew the lines between Council and Pope clearly, but the antagonists were still interdependent. The Council needed the recognition and cooperation of the Papacy, with its centuries-old traditions and prestige, to bolster its authority, while the Papacy had to prevent the spectre of schism from materializing out of the discontent and uncertain loyalties of Christendom. This mixture of need and fear contained the elements of a settlement.

The progress of this struggle of authorities was marked by many individual decisions outside the Curia and Council. As issues arose in Christendom it was necessary for various parties to recognize one or the other, and the cumulative force of these allegiances eventually enabled the Council to preponderate.[22]

---

[20] John of Segovia, L. II c. XX, M.C., II, 124ff; Mansi, XXIX, 21ff. John of Segovia presents the utterance of the Session as a single document. Mansi presents the same text but divides it into six parts.

[21] John of Segovia, L. II c. XIX, M.C., 122.

The first and most important party to adhere to the Council was the Emperor Sigismund. The two most prized ambitions of his life were the regaining of the Bohemians' recognition of himself as their king and his formal coronation as Emperor. It was clear in 1432 that Sigismund's chances of realizing these ambitions were better with the Council than without. The hard papal policy toward Bohemia had only hardened the attitudes of the Hussites toward all external authority and had failed completely to reduce them by arms. In the matter of the imperial coronation, Martin V had shown no enthusiasm for recognizing the status that Sigismund felt was his, and Eugene IV seemed equally reluctant. Sigismund, quite literally, had nothing to lose and everything to gain by adhering to the Council. The course of the Council might win for him in Bohemia, and if it did not his loyalty to it might be traded upon with Eugene to gain papal recognition for Sigismund's imperial status. As it turned out, Sigismund gained both his goals through the Council. With vital interests in both Rome and Basle, Sigismund was the perfect agent through whom a settlement could be arranged, and he played his role well.[23]

---

[22] For an incisive and detailed account of the process by which a single but seemingly typical Prince decided his allegiance, see C. T. Allmand, "Normandy and the Council of Basle," Speculum, XL, 1 (1965), 1. It would seem that the pressures and considerations at work in determining the course of the Duke of Bedford were like those at work in other polities.

The adhesion of other secular princes to the Council was not as close as Sigismund's, and none played such an active role in its affairs, but some did side with it. The Duke of Savoy declared for the Council and prevailed on his nephew, Philip the Good of Burgundy, to do the same. Philip-Maria Visconti, Duke of Milan, who was at odds with Eugene over the affairs of Italian politics, also gave his blessing and support to the Fathers.[24]

In France the decision to join the Council was made by a Gallican synod held in Lyons in late February. The fear of Hussitism and concern for reform were given by the French clergy as their reasons for supporting the Council, and one suspects that Gallican separatism encouraged the decision.[25]

---

[23] The exhaustive study of Sigismund by August Gottschalk, _Kaiser Sigmund als Vermittler zwischen Papst und Konzil, 1431-34_ (Borna-Leipzig: 1911), emphasizes the Emperor's sincere concern for the health and unity of the Church and faith in which the settlement of the Bohemian question and his coronation were side issues. See especially p. 183ff. Valois, I, 270ff virtually ignores Sigismund in this matter. The essential source for the study of Sigismund's role is John of Segovia, L. VI cc. V, VI, _M.C._ II, 464ff.

[24] Valois, I, 152. [25] _Ibid._, 153-60.

While various national and political issues were gaining support for Basle, the enmities within the Papal Curia also produced adherents. In April, 1432, Cardinal Domenico Capranica presented himself at Basle, was incorporated, and immediately sought the Council's confirmation of his office. Martin V had died before the publication of Capranica's elevation, and the Sacred College had refused his admission to the conclave in which Eugene had been elected. Here we have the first defection from the Papacy in the struggle. (It should be noted that Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini was a young secretary in Capranica's entourage.)[26]

Finally, Eugene's appointment of his nephew, Marc Condulmieri, as Bishop of Avignon and Apostolic Vicar of the territory had serious repercussions. The Avignonese revolted against the inept foreign rule that had been theirs for so long, swept the papal forces from the field, and turned to the Council for support. The connection of Avignon and the Papacy was sufficiently repugnant in the popular mind that this incident caused embarrassment far beyond its intrinsic importance.[27]

While the Council was falling heir to the various legacies of the widespread discontent with Rome, Eugene's position was becoming straitened. The harassments of his

---

[26] Ibid., 184-96.

[27] Ibid., 166-75, 260-70.

Italian political enemies occupied what time his ill health left him for official matters.[28] Eugene must have realized rather early that the Council would endure, and the path he followed seems to indicate that he aimed only to concede as little as possible.

In the early summer Eugene finally sent envoys to Basle where they arrived on August 14th. The Council was less than pleased with the embassy which offered nothing and led the Fathers to accuse Eugene of contumacy in their sixth session (September 6, 1433).[29] Three days later Cesarini again became the Council's president.[30]

The accusation of contumacy and the attrition of his support forced Eugene to make some sort of gesture to the Council. He sent envoys again to Basle who attempted vainly to convince the Fathers to translate the site of the Council, and when this failed Eugene revoked his bull of dissolution.[31] Upon examination of the revocation the Fathers noted that it did little more than acknowledge Basle as an acceptable site for a Council. It did not recognize the current gathering there as a Council nor did it acknowledge the canonical quality of its decisions. The Council reacted to the Pope's new decision in its eleventh session (April 27, 1433), when the Fathers restated their devotion to the decrees of Constance and the sovereign authority the Council derived from them.[32]

---

[28] Eugene's illness is discussed fully in Valois, I, 110-11. For Eugene's Italian problems see Valois, I., 294-302, 331-49.

[29] John of Segovia, L. III c. XXXIII, M.C. II, 229ff shows the attitude toward the papal ambassadors. Pages 231ff give the details of the sixth session. See also Mansi, XXIX, 39ff.

[30] John of Segovia, L. III c. XXXV, M.C. II, 233ff.

[31] John of Segovia, L. IV c. XVIII, M.C. II 337ff.

The Emperor Sigismund, who was in Italy in search of his crown, came to the fore in the struggle between Pope and Council at this time. He had manipulated the Italian political situation so that Eugene and he were reconciled, and he was crowned on May 31, 1433. He used the period of the coronation ceremonies to argue for the Council, and he seems to have softened Eugene's heart toward the Fathers in some degree. At least Eugene did nothing to worsen matters.[33]

Sigismund arrived in Basle unannounced and unexpected on October 11, 1433, and set about softening the attitude of the Fathers toward Eugene.[34] He managed to gain for Eugene an extension of time the Pontiff had been given to answer the Council's charges. The delays were sufficient to avoid further action because on December 15, 1433, Eugene recognized the Council, withdrew all existing denunciations of it, and quashed all actions taken against its adherents.[35]

---

[32] John of Segovia, L. IV c. XXVI, M.C. II, 373, gives the reaction of the Fathers to Eugene's revocation of the dissolution. The decrees of the eleventh session are given in John of Segovia, L. IV c. XXVI, M.C. II, 352ff. and Mansi, 52ff.

[33] Valois, I, 243; L. VI c. V, M.C. II. Creighton, 223ff.

[34] John of Segovia, L. VI c. XXV, M.C. 464.

Later Eugene and his supporters would argue that he had not admitted the canonicity of the Council's decrees, but this reservation was not known when the news of Eugene's capitulation reached Basle in January, 1434.[36]

III. THE MEMBERSHIP

The condition of thought concerning general councils of the Church during the fifteenth century was such that it is impossible to determine the number of clerics held to be requisite for a proper council. Christ's assurance that, wheresoever two or three faithful might gather, He would be there also, was the scriptural foundation for the whole conciliar movement, but the few Fathers in Basle during the early days of the Council were insecure about their scant numbers, so insecure that they dispatched Jean Beaupere to seek papal assistance in increasing them. Eugene IV did not take the scriptural license literally either, for he felt that a paucity of members was sufficient justification to attempt the dissolution of the Council.

---

[35] John of Segovia, II, 508ff. Mansi, XXIX, 82ff.

[36] This is discussed fully in Valois, I, 305ff.

Regardless of what the optimum number of participants might have been, this period of struggle and negotiation saw an end to anything that might have been called a paucity. The arguments against the Council broadcast from Rome do not include any based upon a want of members, and the Council ceased to issue pleas and demands for attendance during the early Summer of 1432. The lack of members ceased to be a problem very early during these two years of dispute with Rome. This can be viewed as a triumph for the conciliar ideal or as an indication of widespread disapproval of the Roman leadership of the Church. While these two possibilities are not mutually exclusive, it would seem that discontent with Rome was a more compelling reason for attendance at the Council than the more positive support of conciliarism since the Council wanted so desperately for members in its first seven months but gained a sufficiency shortly following the outbreak of hostilities with Rome.

With the resolution of the Fathers to stand firm on the foundations of Constance and continue their efforts to regain Bohemia, clerics started arriving at Basle and participating in the Council. They were incorporated into the Council at the rate of about twenty per month, and the numbers actively involved in conciliar affairs grew steadily.

The precise numbers involved in the Council at any given moment are impossible to establish, except for rare and special occasions, because there seems to have been no current roster of active members maintained and Fathers seem to have abandoned the Council at will and without record, despite repeated prohibitions of this.

The geographical origins. The geographical origins of the members do not suggest that any particular area dominated the Council. The Fathers came from Europe in a pattern suggesting a general sympathy and support for the position of the Council. This is not to say that the membership systematically represented all of Europe. France, Western Germany, and Northern Italy--the areas of Europe most adjacent to Basle and most populous--supplied the great majority of attendant clerics, and the outlying parts of Europe and Christendom--the areas from which the journey would have been most difficult and most expensive--were sparsely represented if at all.[37]

The Council in this period was primarily concerned with two issues--gaining papal recognition for itself and regaining Bohemian obedience for the Church. The influx of clerics into the Council during this period suggests that its actions evoked support from the European clergy, but it would be well to attempt some determination of which of the Council's activities was basic in evoking this support. An examination of the geographical origins of the Fathers indicates that the overwhelming majority of the arrivals were not from the areas immediately adjacent to Bohemia and hence most directly subject to Hussite pressures. This would indicate that the Council was not in the hands of men who were directly and personally involved with the Hussite problem. At the same time, the areas showing the greatest response to the Council were from France and Northern Italy, areas far removed from Hussite activity.[38]

---

[37] An examination of Appendix I, Chart II, substantiates this conclusion. Note, for example, the scant arrivals from Scotland, Dalmatia, or the various areas of Iberia during this period in contrast with the numbers arriving from these areas in the following period. Conversely, a comparison of the arrivals from the areas comprising France, Western Germany, and Northern Italy during this period and the one following reveal a relative constancy.

---

[38] This is a very difficult matter to judge but the very small number of arrivals from areas directly threatened by the Hussites requires some sort of comment and interpretation. The total numbers of arrivals from the provinces of Magdeburg and Mainz total about one-sixth of the total number incorporated into the Council in this period. Assuming that all of these men were attracted to the Council because of its Hussite policy, and this would be a bold assumption, it is clear that these men could not have dominated the Council by numbers. Certain other areas, Genoa and the non-savoyard parts of Milan, for example, sent proportionately larger parts of their total delegations to Basle during this period than any other. It is not possible to establish any meaningful correlation between the degree of involvement with the Hussite problem in a given area and the number of arrivals from that area. See Appendix I, Chart II.

The differing reactions to the Council from various areas are reflections of the differences among the areas themselves, differences which were deeper or at least more apparent now than they had been before. Linguistic and cultural diversity gave rise to different viewpoints, and the development of routes for trade and travel brought these different viewpoints into abrasive contact. The cause of defending these local viewpoints was slowly shaping the territorial magnates of the past into national leaders whose sympathy and support were rooted in their own lands. The loyalty which the office of a prince required was evoked by his service to the local viewpoint and his successful defense of it against aliens. More and more the representatives of the centralized, ultra-territorial papacy were being regarded as aliens, and the prospect of quarrel within the universalist church was a prospect of gain for the princes. Hence we must expect to see the reflection of local, secular, political interests in the incorporation patterns of the Council. It is customary and probably correct to explain the interest shown in the Council by Milan and by Genoa, which was dominated by Milan in this period, as an aspect of Visconti designs on the Papal States--that is, that the Duke of Milan hoped to contribute to his neighbor's bad fortune through the medium of the hostile Council.[39] It is unfortunate that the interest of the other areas during this period cannot be so neatly explained.

---

[39] See Valois, I, 298ff, 350ff.

Few of the secular lords of Europe were willing to declare their partisanship until the issues were clarified or, even more important, until some indication of the struggle's outcome was evident. Hence the clerics of Europe were remarkably free to go or not to go, to adhere or not to adhere according to the dictates of conscience. Later it will be possible to show how many polities--France, Germany, Savoy, Brittany, and Aragon--attempted to gain some end from the Council, but even then the gain will be seen more as a windfall from the Council's actions, helped along by an occasional shake of the tree, to be sure, than as the product of its willful manipulation. The princes of Europe in the fifteenth century had achieved or were near to achieving the full measure of control over their lands which was possible under the medieval order of divided secular and spiritual authority. Some--most notably in France and England--were well on the way to subsuming the spiritual authority with their own. The course of European history from the Babylonian Captivity through the Great Schism and into the Conciliar Epoch had afforded many opportunities for the state to play contending ecclesiastical factions against one another for its own benefit, and these opportunities had been exploited. The quarreling between Rome and Basle presented a new opportunity for exploitation to the properly situated states. We must not think of dissension in the Church as an unmitigated blessing upon those who held secular power, however, for these quarrels disrupted the tranquility of the various states through the involvement of the local participants. The gain from them depended upon eventually emerging in the same camp with the victor. Hence, the struggle for ecclesiastical power caused trouble at home and brought benefits only through the careful conception and execution of a potentially dangerous policy of involvement. The safest role for a prince in such a struggle was one of aloofness from both parties until the course of the struggle afforded a clear and immediate opportunity for gain.

The official policies of France, England, Brittany, Aragon, and Normandy--[40]the only lands whose relationships with the Council have been systematically studied--were exactly what we would expect in this period. The realization that the Council had a clear claim to legitimacy through Constance, the uncertain power of the Papacy to maintain and assert its traditional position in the Church, and perhaps the hope that conciliar reform would redound to their advantage encouraged the princes of these lands to hold fast to positions of impartiality. This impartiality left the clergy free to express its dissatisfaction with the Papacy through adherence to the Council.

---

[40] R. Wittram, *Die französische Politik auf dem Basler Konzil während der Zeit seiner Blüte* (Riga: 1927); A.N.E.D. Schofield, "The First English Delegation to the Council of Basel," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XII, 185; E. Vaucelle, "La Bretagne et le concile de Bâle," Annales de Saint Louis-des-Francais, X^{e}anee, 1905; Eduard Preiswerk, *Der Einfluss Aragons auf den Prozess des Basler Konzils gegen*

The ranks and offices of the members. Just as conciliar thought did not define the quantity of participants necessary for a Council, so was there no agreement upon the requisite quality of the members. The Council of Basle is unique among several Councils because it admitted to membership all clerics regardless of rank, but practice and custom dictated that the episcopacy would have to be involved if the Council were to succeed. The bishops, more than any other group within the Church, are essential to it. The sacramental and intercessory powers which give the Church its reason for being pass from them and to them, and the efficacy and meaning of conciliar decisions depended, to a large degree, upon their involvement and approval.

The Council in this period received into its membership sixty-two bishops and sixty-five episcopal proctors who represented ninety-six sees.[41] This represents slightly over

---

Papst Eugen IV (Basel:1902); C. T. Allmand, "Normandy and the Council of Basel," Speculum, XL, 1.

[41] For the precise distribution of bishops and episcopal proctors among the various areas for this period see Appendix II, Section II, Chart IV.

—6

50 per cent of the episcopal membership and representation for the whole of the Council despite the fact that this period represents less than 25 per cent of the Council's time-span. Without doubt this is the period of greatest episcopal participation.[42]

The abbots also expressed their greatest interest in the Council during this period with the attendance of sixty-three abbots and twenty-two abbatial proctors, or 40 per cent of those abbots incorporated or represented during the whole of the Council.[43]

Indeed, all ranks and offices of the clergy were most highly represented in this period except for the parish clerks who were virtually dominant later.[44] There is no identifiable variance in geographical distribution among the various ranks and offices of the Fathers.

---

[42] This conclusion is evident from an examination of the data on the incorporation of bishops and episcopal proctors presented in Appendix II, Section II, Chart III.

[43] Appendix II, Section III, Chart III.

[44] An examination of the data presented in Appendix II will bear this out. For the heightened incidence of parish clerics in the later period of the Council see Appendix II Section IV, Chart II.

CHAPTER IV

REFORM, REUNION, AND DISSOLUTION

(PERIOD III: FEBRUARY, 1434--SEPTEMBER, 1437)

The Council entered into this period with bright prospects and great ambitions. It was recognized throughout Europe, well attended, and secure in its record of solid accomplishment. There was no reason to think that the record would not be further embellished in the months and years to come, and it was with the fullest of confidence that the Council approached its new tasks: reform of the Church *in capite et membris* and reunion with the Greeks. The tasks of the Council in this period, however, were substantially different from what they had been previously, and the Council was to learn that the causes of reform and reunion contained problems which were rooted deeply in centuries of practice and tradition. The reduction of Bohemia was an attempt to regain a "normal" situation, to mend the rent in the unseamed garment. The reduction of the Greeks was an attempt at innovation. The Papacy had been forced to make good what many considered the promise of Constance, but reform would require a considerable alteration of specific practices in the Curia. The Council was to find that its power to mend and enforce was greater than its power to create and change.

I. REFORM

As early as the late thirteenth century the changing nature of life in Europe had begun to exert undeniable pressures on the structure of the Roman Church. The Church had no sooner established the supremacy of its spiritual authority over the temporal power of the Empire than it had to face a new threat. As in the struggle with the Empire, the Church found itself challenged by temporal power; but now there was a new dimension. The new challenger, the nascent nation state, did not lay claim to any universal headship over Christians, and it did not deny the abstract bases of papal authority. Indeed, in this early period when the new struggle centered in the contest between Boniface VIII and Philip IV, it is difficult to establish any conflict on points of basic principle. Philip carefully avoided being drawn into any dispute over architectonic questions and confined his participation in the quarrel to protests over specific issues; e.g., he did not deny the Church's right to tax but argued that at the moment the realm could not afford the export of bullion.[1] That Philip won his struggle with Boniface shows that the arrangement of power in Europe was changing and that the Church was not adapting to the changes.

---

[1] R. Scholz, Die Publizistik zur Zeit Philipps des Schönen und Bonifaz VIII (Stuttgart: 1903).

The accretion of the power of the secular princes particularized Europe; and the ideal of Christendom as a universal, generalized community lessened as an influence in the structuring of thought and behavior. The development of this particularization went on contemporaneously with the centralization of papal authority in the fourteenth century.[2] These contradictory processes were bound to produce tensions within the Church which would have to be reconciled, and there was no prospect that this reconciliation could be amicable. Marsilius of Padua and William of Occam launched the campaign against the ecclesiastical system with a categorical and systematic attack on the whole concept of hierarchical organization.[3] Agostino Trionfo and Alvar Pelayo supported the existing papal power so strongly that their arguments went beyond the existing claims.[4]

Thus were the issues drawn among the theorists of ecclesiastical power and organization. To the modern mind, accustomed to thinking in terms of change and adaptation, it appears to be a struggle between the advocates of change and reaction. The medieval mind, oriented toward authority and fixed on the timeless nature of divine will, did not conceive of institutional change as an expected and healthy adjustment to new circumstances. What we would call the need for change a medieval thinker would style as the need for reform--the rooting out of some evil which had crept in and the return to some ill-recalled condition which had been in existence at some vaguely designated time in the past.

---

[2] G. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon (1305-1378)*, Ch. 12 (Paris: 1912).

[3] Johann Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform. Vier Kapitel zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (Berlin: 1903), 74ff.

[4] *Ibid.*, 81ff.

The conciliar movement itself was a part of the reform movement of the fourteenth century, that is, conciliarism was a device by which the universal Church could be informed of the attitudes and problems of various parts obedient to it and through which the practices of the Church could be moulded to fit best its role in these part. Other lines of reform thought, however, went beyond the rather moderate controls on the central authority of the Papacy envisaged by the conciliarists. It was in France that the drive for self-determination in ecclesiastical affairs first culminated in a stated program.[5] This statement was called the "Gallican Liberties" which were published in 1407 and virtually denied the Papacy any role in French ecclesiastical affairs.[6] Just as the Great Schism had given force, direction, and opportunity to the conciliarists, so did it afford the needed pre-conditions for the French action. The distress in the upper levels of the Church obviated the possibility of any powerful papal response.[7]

---

[5] *Ibid.*, 285.

[6] *Ibid.*

Although the focus of scholarly attention is rightly on France in this matter, England was developing in the same manner and toward the same end. Johann Haller feels that by the beginning of the pontificate of Martin V, the Church in England was completely nationalized.[8]

The next attempts of the reformers to adjust the structure of the Church to their conception of the world around them would be made in the Councils of Constance, Siena, and Basle and in the presence of a resurgent Papacy.

The reform work of the earlier Councils. Nothing is more strongly associated with conciliarism and the fifteenth century Councils than the subject of reform. The Great Schism which had given impetus to conciliar thought was viewed not only as an embarrassing constitutional crisis but also as a frightful symptom of longstanding and deeply rooted ills in the "head and members" of the Church. The curing of these ills was as much a part of the aims of the conciliarists and the conciliar Fathers as was the repairing of the Schism.

At Constance the Fathers repeatedly identified the healing of the Schism with the problem of reform in head and members. They first stated this identity in a decree of their fifth session.[9] In the decree Frequens, along with providing for periodic future Councils and papal loyalty to them, the Fathers denied to the Pope the right to fill high ecclesiastical offices unilaterally and forbade the practice of papal reservation.[10] Finally, in the forty-third session, decrees were promulgated concerning exemptions, dispensations, simony, the integrity of the clergy, and other matters, the details of which were to be negotiated in concordats with the various nations by Martin V.[11] This reliance on papal authority and good faith is indicative of the optimism and good will which flowed from the achievement of union, while the continued concern over these same matters at Siena and Basle reflects the later disappointment of reform-minded churchmen with the actual papal performance.

---

[7] *Ibid.*, 205ff.

[8] *Ibid.*, 464.

In keeping with Frequens, the forty-fourth session of Constance selected Pavia as the site of the next Council which was to meet in 1423, but political difficulties and plague caused the Council to be moved to Siena in its early days. The influence of the Pope and Curia at this Italian site were sufficient to insure against any thorough discussion of reform. Only the French, who were concerned with securing their Gallican Liberties, presented any reform proposals, and these led to nothing.[12] This Council adjourned in early 1424 after having accomplished little more than the selection of Basle as the site for the next Council in 1431.

---

[9] Mansi, XXVII, 590; Edmund Bursche, Die Reformarbeiten des Basler Konzils (Lodz: 1921), 2.

[10] Mansi, XXVII, 1159-1162; Bursche, 2.

[11] Mansi, XXVII, 1174ff; Bursche, 3.

On February 1, 1431, after mounting pressure had made it unavoidable,[13] Martin V discharged his obligation under Frequens by appointing Julian Cardinal Cesarini, already papal legate to Germany for the projected anti-Hussite crusade, as papal legate to and president of the Council of Basle. In defining Cesarini's duties and the province of the Council, Martin designated "above all" the "reformation in practices and life of all the clergy and of the Church."[14] Martin's performance in the area of reform gives reason to wonder about the sincerity of this mandate, but the cause of reform was warmly embraced by the Fathers, at least in the abstract, for they designated reform as the basic concern of one of their four deputations.

---

[12] Bursche, 3f, 14; Richard Zwölfer, "Die Reform der Kirchenverfassung auf dem Konzil zu Basel," Basler Zeitschrift fur Geschichte und Altertumskunde (hereafter cited BZGA), XXVIII, 151ff, 202ff, XXIX, 3ff. The story of French frustrations at Siena is told by John of Ragusa, Initium et prosecutio Basiliensis concilii, M.C. I, 33-50.

[13] Lazarus, 17ff; John of Ragusa, Initium et prosecutio . . ., M.C. I, 65-67.

[14] John of Segovia, L. I. c. XXVI, M.C. II, 54.

The reform work at Basle. At Basle, as at Constance and Siena, the actual work of reform was easily put aside for more immediate issues. The struggle with Rome and the absorbing business with the Bohemians came first, and it was two full years after its opening that the Council, in its twelfth session (July 13, 1433), turned to the matter of reform and decreed local control of the elections of bishops, abbots, and other church officials in denial of papal reservation.[15] This was followed in the fifteenth session (November 26, 1433) with provisions for annual diocesan and provincial synods which were to oversee the local bishops and archbishops.[16]

These decrees were only a beginning of the Basle reform work. The true force and direction of the Council's work in this area are seen in the decrees of the twentieth, twenty-first, and twenty-third sessions (January 22, 1435; June 9, 1435; March 24, 1436).[17] All but two[18] of these decrees had the effect of limiting papal power and granting greater control and freedom to the lower ranks of the hierarchy. The practices of excommunication and interdiction were limited in application to the specific individuals involved in the offense being punished. This limitation had the effect of blunting these instruments so that they could not be used as political weapons to mount pressure against a papal antagonist. The collection of annates, the collation of benefices and the appeal to Rome of litigation concerning them, the practice of papal reservation, and the sale of expectancies were severely limited or abolished. Finally, strict rules aimed at guaranteeing the loyalty of any future Pope to the conciliar ideal were imposed on the Sacred College to govern their selection of a Pontiff, and stringent qualifications were set for the creation of future cardinals.[19]

---

[15] John of Segovia, L. V. c. VIII, M.C. II, 402; Mansi, XXVIII, 61.

[16] John of Segovia, L. VI. c. XXXI, M.C. II, 525; Mansi, XXVIII, 74.

[17] Session 20: H-L, VII, pt. 2, 882ff; Mansi, XXIX, 101ff. John of Segovia, L. IX. c. XII, M.C., II, 773ff. Session 21: H-L, VII, pt. 2, 885ff; Mansi, XXIX, 104ff; John of Segovia, L. IX. c. XXIII, M.C., 801ff. Session 23: H-L, VII, pt. 2, 918ff; Mansi, XXIX, 110ff; John of Segovia, L. IX. c. XLII, M.C., II, 847ff.

[18] The twentieth session issued a decree dealing with clerical concubinage; the twenty-first session attempted to insure the dignity and propriety of holy services.

---

[19] The decrees concerning excommunication, interdict, and the limitations on the right of appeal to Rome were published in the twentieth session. The twenty-first session published the decrees concerning annates and the collation of benefices, but the limitations on benefice-connected litigation were not published until the thirty-first session (December 24, 1438).

This matter is included here because it is so clearly associated in spirit with these reforms and because it was discussed here. The qualifications of Pope and Cardinals were decreed in the twenty-third session. The first problem encountered in studying the reforms of the Council is the determination of which of the decrees should be considered as reforms. Bursche includes the decrees of the early session which reaffirmed _Frequens_ and otherwise defined the Council's position as well as the decree of the nineteenth session (September 7, 1434) concerning the conversion of Jews and the

Johann Haller has argued convincingly that the reform effort of Basle was the focus of the reform movement of the later middle ages.[20] What preceded Basle in the field of reform was foundation for what happened there; what followed was in large part the working out of the inevitable results. Basle may well be crucial in the history of the ecclesiastical movement, but it does not necessarily follow that reform was uppermost in the minds of the Fathers. It is hard to follow the assertion of Richard Zwölfer that "the Basle Fathers viewed the reform of the Church as the most important of their three tasks."[21] A casual examination of the protocols for the very time when the Council was busiest with reform reveals that the Fathers spent far more time adjudicating appealed litigation, most of which was fully as frivolous as that removed from papal view by the decree of the twentieth

---

conditions of neophytes, and that of the thirty-sixth session (September 17, 1439) defining the cult of Mary. He admits that these latter two are at least tangential to reform. Zwölfer is concerned only with those reforms which touched the ecclesiastical administration which he treats under the following titles: (1) The filling of church offices, (2) Annates and fines, (3) Ecclesiastical judicial procedure, and (4) The Curia. Under these headings he deals with the decrees mentioned above.

[20] Johann Haller, Papsttum und Kirchenreform (Berlin: 1903); "Die Kirchenreform auf dem Konzil zu Basel," Korrespondenzblatt des Gesamtvereins der deutschen Geschichts und Altertumsvereine, 58. Jahrgang, 1910, 9ff.

[21] Zwölfer, BZGA, XXVIII, 144.

session, than they did forging basic reform legislation. Another cause to wonder about the Fathers' devotion to the cause of reform is that, as we have already observed, the Council had been sitting for two years before any reform work was completed, and it was five years before the Fathers finished their effort.

The reform work and the Council's membership. The primary contribution which the study of the reform work can make to our understanding of the membership of the Council lies in the establishment of the aims which the Fathers held for their reforms. It is most commonly held that the aim of the Basilian reforms was the destruction of the Papacy as an element in the ecclesiastical power structure and that this aim was prosecuted by cynical careerists and the irresponsible, radical riff-raff of the lower clergy with the aim of gaining advancement or advantage within the Church.[22] In support of this view it is customary to cite: (1) the disproportionately large amount of attention given the *reformatio in capite* in contrast to that given to the reformatio in membris;[23] (2) the effect of the reforms in weakening the Papacy; and (3) the fact that the Council did not scruple to continue some of the papal practices which they publicly deemed vicious.[24]

---

[22] This view permeates the older literature. See, specifically, Ludwig Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, I, 323ff; Georg Voigt, *Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini als Papst Pius, und sein Zeitalter*, I, 75ff, 109f; Mandell Creighton, *History of the Papacy*, II, 116f, 266ff, 270ff, 273ff. On this point Zwölfer says that "in the final analysis all of these charges go back to the tendentious statements of Aeneas Silvius, a man who, in the interest of his own career, could not damn the Council enough. . .," *BZGA*, XXIX, 24.

All of these allegations are true, but they do not establish the authors of the decrees as hypocrites who had seized the name of reform as a cloak for their ulterior, destructive ends. The very limited success of the Fathers in defining and proposing solutions for the problems of the "members" does not imply fault or folly in their reforms of the "head." The tight, centralized control of the Papacy as seen in the acceptance of legal jurisdiction over the most insignificant of matters, the reservation of distant offices, and the collation of benefices without regard to local conditions were regarded as problems long before the Fathers of Basle addressed them. The cost of papal administration could be borne only by practices such as the collection of annates, which could reduce a diocese to insolvency, or the sale of expectancies, which might fill an office with an ill-equipped holder bent upon gaining a return on his investment. Any action aimed at alleviating the widespread discontent with papal administrative or fiscal practices would have the concomittant effect of limiting papal prerogative so the proposals of the reformer who was sincerely interested in

---

[23] Zwölfer, BZGA, XXIX, 52ff, treats this problem directly. He argues that the "head" was in fact in greater need of reform than the "members," both in degree and because the reform of the "members" was dependent upon the reform of the "head." He further points out that the Fathers did not have a pre-existent scheme for the "reformatio in membris" while there was much preliminary work to follow in the "reformatio in capite," particularly the Gallican Freedoms, and that the Council lacked a leader capable of reconciling the contradictory interests and defining the issues involved so work could be done. (One could well wonder if such a leader existed.) Finally, he agrees with John of Segovia who observed that there is a large gap between preaching reform and implementing it. "Reformatio in membris" meant that the Fathers would have to set their own houses in order while "reformatio in capite" gave them the opportunity to right the wrongs in the alien Papacy and Curia.

[24] The two most blatant examples of this were the acceptance of jurisdiction over frivolous litigation and the collection of annates. In the first case, it must be remembered that the Council was constantly struggling to assert its position over the Papacy and the acceptance of appeals and the rendering of decisions was one way of doing this. Litigants were accustomed to appealing unfavorable decisions in local courts to a higher authority, and they were not going to stop just because of a conciliar decree. A case is never frivolous to the person who has lost it. Had the Council refused to hear these appeals it would have driven potential partisans into the opposing camp. It should be noted here that the whole subject of the Council as a court is the largest virgin

---

area of research left in the study of the Council, and it must be investigated before the Council can be understood in its entirety.

In attempting to gain position and prestige over the Papacy, the Council, as a part of the reform of the ecclesiastical fisc, ordered all moneys owed to the Pope to be diverted to Basle. See Mansi, XXIX, 439, XXX, 923. Some areas obedient to the Council continued to send the customary dues to Basle for a long while, and the Council, which was always financially straitened, needed the funds. Cf. Joseph Gill, The Council of Florence (Cambridge: 1959), 61ff; Alexander Eckstein, Zur Finanzlage des Basler Konzils (Berlin: 1911).

obviating the abuses *in capite* would be very similar to those of the anti-Romanist. Furthermore, the hesitancy of Rome in embracing and implementing the suggested reforms must have encouraged many sincere reformers to conclude that the Pope and curial officials, if not the very institution of the Papacy, were their enemies. Many reform-minded clerics, particularly those with no great material stake in the existent system, must have crossed and recrossed the line separating reform within the system from denial of the whole hierarchical structure without recognizing their path.

The specific studies of the reform work are more sympathetic to the ends and aims of the Fathers, but they are more successful in establishing the content and effect of the reforms than in explaining their intent. Bursche treats the problem of motivation among the reformers in a largely negative manner, by asserting repeatedly the lack of "piety" and the insufficient "depth of religious motives."[25] What he means in specific, objective terms is not clear,and he does not explain what he feels substituted for piety and religious feeling in motivating the Council in the area of reform. Zwölfer is concerned only with the content of those reforms which were meant to affect the ecclesiastical administration. He deals with intent only in the very narrow sense of the intended effect the reforms would have on the way the Church was administered, and he treats the broader problem of the condition of spiritual life and the Fathers' hopes for it hardly at all.[26]

---

[25] Bursche, 52f, 119ff.

Johann Haller[27] is the only student of the Basle reform effort who deals directly and positively with the problem of the basic aims of the reformers. After placing the reforms of Basle in the context of the late-medieval reform movement and establishing and defending them against the frequent charges of aberrant radicalism,[28] Haller proceeds to explain the effect of the reforms. He asserts that the victor in the struggle between the Council and the Papacy was neither of the adversaries but the secular state.[29] The instrument of this victory was the reform decrees of Basle which remained ineffective in church law but were of the greatest importance when implemented by secular law.[30] The clearest example of this, of course, is the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, the core of which is the work of the Basilian Fathers.[31]

---

[26] Zwölfer, BZGA, XXIX, 46ff.

[27] "Die Kirchenreform auf dem Konzil zu Basel," Korrespondenzblatt des Gesamtvereins der deutschen Geschichts - und Altertums Vereine, 58. Jahrgang, 1910, 9ff.

[28] Ibid., 15f.

[29] Ibid., 20. Zwölfer, who makes no mention of this work nor Bursche's, comes to the same conclusion in almost identical words. BZGA, XXIX, 54.

[30] Ibid., 24.

The emancipation of the national churches from the central authority of Rome was already accomplished in France and England, and the beginnings had been made elsewhere well before the Council of Basle. Hence, the effect of the Basilian reforms was to nationalize more completely the Church where a national state already existed and to territorialize the church elsewhere, notably in Germany and Italy.[32] Haller sees the reforms of Basle as instrumental in breaking Roman authority over the Church and passing that authority over to the secular princes. "The principle _cuius regio, eius religio_, the Protestation of Speyer, and the protection of Luther from papal bann and imperial outlawry would have been impossible had the concept of ecclesiastical, territorial autonomy not been held for three generations in Germany, just as it had been in England and France, as a customary element of the public law and of the dominant concept of the state. We can see, then, that the Council of Basle is not a blind alley, that it does not hang from a dead trace. The way of historical development leads directly from Basle to Wittenburg and Worms."[33]

---

[31] _Ibid_. The exact relationship between the reforms of the Council and the Pragmatic Sanction is shown in _H-L_, VII, pt. 2, 1056ff, with painstaking detail and exemplary clarity.

[32] _Ibid_., 26.

There is no doubt, then, concerning Haller's views of the effect and role of the Basilian reforms, but we are concerned here with his view of their intent. On this point he says that "even a blind man with a stick could perceive that an ecclesiastical administration such as the Council had worked out would increase greatly the power of the state in ecclesiastical matters,"[34] and he asserts further that the Basilian reformers "all knew what they were doing and when they played into the hands of the secular state through the reform decrees of the Council, we must assume that they did not intend something else."[35] Haller then asks, "Would it really be so surprising if, in an age of emergent national states, the clergy, in its preponderant majority, would, like others, hold feelings and thoughts of nation and state above all others?"[36]

Haller's views on the Basilian reforms are available to us only in the printed text of a public address,[37] and they are only a scheme. The third and fourth chapters of his

---

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., 21.

[35] Ibid., 25.

[36] Ibid.

[37] The address was delivered before the Hauptversammlung of the Gesamtverein der deutschen Geschichts - und Altertumsvereine in the first general and public session at Worms on September 9, 1909.

Papstum und Kirchenreform,[38] where the full and substantiated exposition of his ideas on Basle would have appeared,[39] were never published. His views can be treated only as what they are: the preliminary thesis which a scholar of great accomplishment would have used to explain the intent, the effect, and the nature of the reforms.

This thesis is extremely helpful here because it embodies and utilizes an assumption about the collective aims of the Council's members; that is, they were guided by the conscious aim of achieving through the Council a benefit for their respective secular lords. This same assumption is encouraged by the incorporation patterns of the later Council, and by using it it is possible to see a relationship between the changing nature of the Council and the changing nature of the groups of men who presented themselves for incorporation into the Council.

As we have seen above, the first three and one half years of the Council, until January 22, 1435, were virtually barren of reform; then, in three great sessions in the course of fifteen months, a whole new church administrative system was handed down. After this exertion the Council left the matter of reform for all time. Before this period of reform the Fathers were occupied with the establishment of the Council's position in ecclesiastical affairs and with prosecuting the negotiations with the Bohemians. After it they were absorbed in the Greek question from which flowed the illfated second struggle with Eugene and the disastrous Basilian Schism. The time during which the Fathers published their reforms is peculiar for two reasons. First, it is the period of greatest tranquility in the relations between the Council and Papacy--the first reforms were decreed a full year after Eugene recognized the Council, and the last were published several months before the opening rounds of the new quarrel with Rome. Second, the reforms were promulgated at the very time when the most basic changes were taking place in the nature of the men who were presenting themselves for incorporation. From the beginning of the Council the pattern created by the incorporation of the Fathers suggested nothing but a generalized, pan-European support for the actions and position of the Council. The Fathers came in numbers considerable enough to silence the claims that the Council had failed for want of members, and the ranks and offices of the initiates were sufficient to give the Council the necessary dignity. The Council's success in mitigating the Bohemian problem and in gaining papal recognition for itself was followed by a remarkable decline in the numbers and quality of new members. The frequency of men of rank among the new arrivals would continue to decline for the remainder of the Council, but the overall numbers would increase. The rate of arrivals in the fifth period of the Council was 140 per cent of what it had been in the second, and over 200 per cent of what it had been in the third.[40] However, the rate of incorporation for bishops and their proctors dropped in the fifth period to 25 per cent of the rate for the third period and to 8 per cent for the second.[41] In the same fifth period, the incorporation of parish clerics would amount to thirteen times the rate for the third period and seventeen times the rate for the second.[42]

---

[38] Volume I was composed of the Erstes Capitel: "Das Papstum von Avignon und das Reformprogramm des XV. Jahrhundert," and the Zweites Kapitel: "Der Ursprung der Gallikanischen Freiheiten," and was published at Berlin in 1903.

[39] Indeed, Papsttum und Kirchenreform was conceived by Haller as an essential Vorarbeit to a projected history of the Council of Basle. See Vorwort.

Remarkable changes in the pattern of the geographic origins of the new members accompanied the changes in rank. No longer do the arriving clerics present a picture of generalized European support for the Council. In the fourth period, one out of seven arrivees came from Aragon,[43] almost half the number from all of France or Germany. Aragonese interest continued in the fifth period, but it paled in comparison with the numbers from Brittany or Savoy.[44] More than one out of three arrivees in this period was Breton or Savoyard. The sudden interest in conciliar affairs from these disparate areas is explained below in the appropriate chapters,[45] and it must suffice here to say that the Aragonese, Bretons, and Savoyards were motivated by considerations of their respective state interests which were substantially extraneous to conciliar affairs --considerations of local, territorial interest.

---

[40] Introduction to Appendix I, p.

[41] Appendix II, Section II, Chart III.

[42] Appendix II, Section IV, Chart II.

[43] Appendix I, Chart III.

[44] Ibid.

If we follow Haller and treat the reform decrees as the product of men who were seeking a generalized, secular, political goal--local, secular control over ecclesiastical affairs--which would be specifically beneficial to their individual polities, the incorporation patterns for the later Council suggests a very similar interpretation. The Council, by 1435 or 1436, had ceased to be useful for the accomplishment of generally desired ends, and it continued to attract sizable numbers of new members only from areas with specific problems which the Council could help in solving or a policy which the Council could further. There is no doubt that the areas from which sizable numbers of new members came--Aragon, Brittany, and Savoy--had such problems or policies and there can be little doubt that the clerics from these areas came because of them.[46]

---

[45] Aragon, Chapter V, p. 146ff; Brittany and Savoy, Chapter I, p. 161ff.

[46] The extrapolation of Haller's thesis to explain the incorporation patterns of the later Council suggests an interesting research topic. As we have seen above, the remarkable increase in the numbers of arrivals from Aragon,

II. REUNION

The attempts of the Council to achieve the union of the Eastern and Western Churches is a simple story often told.[47] There is little use in telling it again here except to emphasize that it was through this effort that the Fathers worked success into failure and failure into disaster.

The background. The hope for union among the various branches of the Christian faith is a constant theme throughout the middle ages and even into our own time, but the circumstances of the early fifteenth century made the realization of that dream seem a distinct possibility. Since the Latin conquest of Constantinople two centuries before, the Byzantine state had grown steadily weaker and less able to

---

Brittany, and Savoy occurs at the same time as an increase in the numbers from the lower clergy and a decrease in the upper clergy. If, as the extrapolation from Haller suggests, these men were the conscious agents of their princes, then it is clear that the princes were relying on members of the lower clergy to further their interests. This suggests a number of possible meanings, the most enticing and exciting of which is the existence of an *entente* between the lower clergy or selected or placed members of it, and the princes, which formed an instrument for the furthering of state control over the Church to the detriment of the central papal authority.

[47] The foundation of modern scholarship on this subject is a study of Johann Haller, "Unionsverhandlungen und Konflikt mit der Kurie," *C.B.*, I. The negotiations between the Council and the Greeks until February, 1437, is told clearly and well in I. Zlocisti, *Die Gesandtschaft des Basler Konzils nach Avignon und Konstantinopel (1437-1438)* (Halle: 1908), Ch. I. An equally fine and even more detailed treatment is in Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence*, Ch. III (Cambridge: 1959).

fend for itself against the rising power of the Turks. The Greeks had gained a respite in the late fourteenth century when the phenomenon of Tamerlane had forced the Turks to halt their conquest in the West and to look defensively to the East. But Tamerlane died in 1405, and the following generation saw the Turks renew their traditional policy of expansion to the West. Political reality predominated over historical fear, and the Greeks came to realize that they had to look to the West if they were to survive. The Greeks had sought and gained some minor military aid from the secular powers,[48] but the Byzantine state was a theocracy, and it proceeded on the assumption that political and military aid from the West would be governed by ecclesiastical and theological considerations.[49] Indeed, the assumption was not completely invalid. Europe in the fifteenth century was at a crisis as the contest for power between the new, particular, secular *nationes* and the old, pan-European, spiritual *ecclesia* heightened. At this time, however, the new order had not yet predominated and the central, spiritual authority was still able to determine affairs. The Papacy was strengthened in this instance by the theological cast put on the essentially political problem of military aids by the theocratic Byzantines and the general remembrance of its past crusading glory.

---

[48] George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: 1957), 492ff.

[49] *Ibid.*, 475-509.

The likelihood of union was still strengthened at this particular moment by the need of the Papacy for a certain species of accomplishment. The sojourn of the Bishops of Rome at Avignon and the scandal of schism which followed had lessened the prestige of the Papacy, and prestige was the essential element of papal power. The Fathers of Constance had repaired the Papacy, but their lack of confidence in it was shown in Frequens. If Martin V was to be a Pope in the grand style, he had to achieve some grand goal. The realization of the hoary but still emotionally meaningful ideal of union plus the prospect of a gallant crusade against the infidel would go far in regaining what the Papacy had lost. Even if the achievement of these goals was only partial or even if they were not achieved, the very act of attempting them would gain much for the Papacy.[50]

Martin did much in the years after Constance to implement this policy,[51] but at the time when the foundations were finished Martin died, and it would be his successor, Eugene IV, who would build upon them. The time had also come for the summoning to Basle, and in a few short months the headship of the Western Church was again in question. The Greeks were presented with Pope and Council, each claiming to be the legitimate and paramount authority, vying for the privilege of negotiating with them.

---

[50] This is not to deny an element of piety and a sincere hope for unity on the part of Martin V, but he could not have been unaware of the secular, political aspects of his policy. Gill adequately deals with Martin's higher motives.

[51] These are carefully presented in Gill, Chapter II.

It is ironic that the Byzantines, who were willing to bargain away their identity in a last, vain attempt to alter the events about to destroy them, should find it within their power to determine the outcome, at least temporarily, of the struggle for hegemony within the Western Church. It is impossible to know what would have happened had the Byzantines agreed to go to Basle, but at least it would have strengthened the position of the Fathers, and it certainly would have obviated the specific cause which disrupted and eventually destroyed the Council.

The work of the Council. The first positive act of the Council in seeking union with the Greeks was the dispatching of an embassy to Constantinople in January, 1433, with the responsibility of fetching the Eastern Emperor and the Patriarch, or their plenipotentiaries, to Basle for the negotiation of union.[52] The ambassadors returned to Basle in July, 1434, with a Greek delegation, but it was only empowered to make the preliminary arrangements for the talks of union, specifically, to select an acceptable site, and even on this they were limited. The Byzantine Emperor preferred a site in Calabria or the city of Ancona with the provision that Milan or Bologna would be acceptable if necessity took the conference away from the seacoast and, if the talks could not be held in Italy, he would tolerate Buda,[53] Vienna, or some appropriate location in Savoy. Furthermore, the Westerners would have to meet the expenses of the Greeks, coming and going, even if the talks led to nothing.[54] In September, the preliminary draft of an agreement was adopted by the Council, endorsed by the Greek emissaries, and forwarded to Constantinople for ratification.[55]

---

[52] John of Segovia, L. IV. c. VI, M.C., 293; Zlocisti, 4; Gill, 54ff.

---

[53] For some inexplicable reason, Creighton, II, 267, says Pest.

[54] John of Segovia, L. IX. c. III, M.C., II, 745, 749; Gill, 54ff.

[55] John of Segovia, L. IX. c. VI, M.C., II, 752ff; Gill, 58; Zlocisti, 5. The sorry state of affairs in Constantinople can be seen in this agreement which provided: (1) the conference of union would be held in a Calabrian city or Ancona or at another maritime place, otherwise in an Italian city such as Bologna or Milan, or, if outside Italy, at a Savoyard city, Buda, or in Vienna; (2) the Emperor John and the largest possible number of spiritual dignitaries of the Eastern Church would come to the conference; (3) the ambassadors of the Council should go to Constantinople to participate in a General Council of the Greek Church and the Council should contribute 8,000 ducats toward the expenses of the Council, which sum to be repaid if the Greeks declined to participate in the conference of union; (4) the Roman church should defray all of

The Council now was faced with two tasks, both of which were to prove to be beyond it: it had to reach an agreement among its members on a site, and it had to raise the money to get the Greeks to it.

Eugene was also arranging a meeting with the Greeks through his secretary, Christopher Garatoni, who had been dispatched to Constantinople in July, 1433. There is little point in recounting the story of this competition between Rome and Basle. The Greeks preferred an Italian site, and the Pope was there; they required money and the Pope had reserves and revenues; they needed crusade-like military aid and the Papacy had a tradition of leadership in crusades, and the Pope had an experienced diplomatic service to compete with the Council's melange of theologians and country bishops. The Pope had everything, the Council nothing.[56]

Obviously, the Council did not enter into the negotiations with the Greeks and the competition with the Papacy with the assessment of the situation expressed above. They looked

---

the costs of the Greeks for the round-trip; (5) the Greek Emperor should receive a special grant of 15,000 ducats; and (6) the Council should, in the ten months following November, 1434, dispatch to Constantinople two large and two small ships with 300 bowmen for the purpose of defending the city during the absence of the Emperor, and bear the cost of outfitting and maintaining the ships and men as well as maintaining a contingency fund of 10,000 ducats for use in case of a Turkish attack.

[56] This competition is recounted in Gill, Chapter II.

upon this work as a new pursuit in the causa fidei and a continuation of the activity which had gained success for them in the Hussite negotiations.[57] They set about raising the funds and selecting a site. The Council quickly failed in the first of these tasks, but not before it had compromised itself by imitating the fiscal practices of the Papacy and revealing to all its fiscal insolvency.[58] Finally, the Fathers decided to raise the necessary money by demanding a contribution of seventy thousand ducats from the host city in return for the prestige and possible profit from the conference.[59]

With this problem temporarily shelved, the Council could turn to the selection of a site. The discussion of this matter must have seemed without end because the places acceptable to the Greeks which were willing to pay the money were subject to papal influence and therefore unacceptable to a majority of the Fathers, and the places acceptable to the conciliar majority could not command the necessary funds.[60] This dilemma divided the Council into two camps, the smaller, which contained a disproportionately high share of the members of rank, was willing to settle for a site in Italy and risk the danger of Eugene's domination of the negotiations, and the larger, whose actions revealed that its hatred, or fear, of Eugene was greater than its love of union. The camps became more and more distinct until the issue was objectively drawn in the vote of December 5, 1436. On this day, over two-thirds of the members did an incredible and inexplicable thing: they voted in favor of Avignon as the site for the negotiations with the Greeks in violation of their agreement of September, 1434. The majority justified itself with supreme casuistry by claiming that Avignon's deepwater access to the Mediterranean made it *terra maritima* and since it was on the best route to Savoy it was included in the agreement.[61] Cesarini spoke against this action with force and cogency, spelling out in detail its hazards and shortcomings, but still the majority persisted.[62] In the months which followed, the division of the Council was transformed into schism. The majority received a severe blow in February, 1437, when the Greeks flatly rejected Avignon and another in April[63] when the Avignonese defaulted on the payment of the money, but the majority was steadfast and clung to its choice. In the twenty-fifth session (May 7, 1437) the whole affair came to an unseemly end. Despite attempts to reconcile the parties, which continued up to the very opening of the session, nothing could be done, and after the opening devotionals the spokesmen for the majority took the rostrum and began to read a decree reaffirming Avignon. Immediately the representative of the minority jumped upon a table and began reading a decree holding that the default of Avignon meant that the second choice of the vote of December 5, 1436, Florence, Udine, or another acceptable Italian site, was the conciliar will. The latter decree was shorter and upon completion its partisans intoned a lusty *Te Deum* which drowned the voice of the opposition. Before the minority's *Te Deum* was finished, the majority began theirs.[64] The effect can be imagined. The following days continued the hostilities through a quarrel over which decree was to receive the conciliar seal. On May 20th a delegation of the minority party, including Nicholas of Cusa and in company with the

---

[57] Indeed, the Council infuriated the Greeks by stating this view and thereby juxtaposing the heretical Bohemians with the Orientals in the preamble to the preliminary agreement of September, 1434. John of Segovia, L. IX. c. VI, M.C., II 752; Gill, 64.

[58] The Council wanted a special Greek-tithe collected throughout Europe and for the Pope to divert his annates, which the Council had condemned, to the conciliar treasury. Eugene was not enthusiastic about the first and, not surprisingly, even cooler to the second proposal. See A. Eckstein, Zur Finanzlage des Basler Konzils (Berlin: 1911), 21ff; Gill 68ff, 73f.

[59] Originally this was to be a loan secured by the tenth, Gill, 70.

---

[60] This is well described in Creighton, II, 295f.

[61] The majority's defense of its action is covered in John of Segovia, L.X. cc XXVII-XXX, *M.C.*, II, 906ff.

[62] John of Segovia, L.X. c. XXI, *M.C.*, II, 912ff.

---

[63] Gill, 72.

[64] John of Segovia, L. XI. c. IX., *M.C.*, II, 965; Gill, 73. John of Segovia, or his editor, has misdated this session as March 7th.

Greek representatives, departed for Bologna, where Eugene was in residence, with the unsealed minority decree, the first of many defections from Basle to the Pope and later to Florence.[65] Needless to say, Eugene welcomed the minority delegation, and on May 30, 1437, he issued a bull recognizing the minority as the pars sanior and calling a Council for Florence in a semblance of cooperation with the true Council. At the same time, the leader of the Greek embassy also recognized the minority.[66]

The confusing problem of the disputed headship in the Western Church was now resolved for the Greeks. From their point of view, the Council and the Pope were of one mind, and that mind was determined to negotiate union and political support at a suitable place and on suitable terms. Eugene was very happy, too. The schism in the Council and the minority defections cleared the path for papal negotiations with the Greeks as well as presenting the legal solution to the problem of the Council. Eugene could now rest quietly in the attitude that he was in perfect harmony with the true Council and simply disregard the mutterings of the malcontents in Basle. The Fathers of the majority party were the only ones not accommodated. They had maintained the purity of the Council and had retained control of it, but in holding the Council they had excluded themselves from any part of the glory attached to the cause of union and had presented Eugene with a near perfect opportunity to disregard them. They had plunged themselves into a struggle to reestablish the majesty of the Council which they could not possibly win, and with their failure the objectives of Constance would be lost.

---

[65] John of Segovia, L. XI. c. XIII, M.C., II, 976.

[66] Gill, 77ff.

III. DISSOLUTION

The events following Eugene's diplomatic victory over the Fathers in the matter of who was to negotiate union with the Greeks reflect the new positions of the antagonists. There was nothing the Fathers could do to dissuade the Greeks from treating with Eugene so they had to confront Eugene directly and attempt to subordinate him to their will. In its twenty-sixth session (July 31, 1437), the Council issued a decree calling Eugene to account for his conduct, in person or by proctor, within sixty days. The bill of particulars in this monition is so vague that one wonders if the Council knew exactly of what it was accusing Eugene. It impugned his good faith toward the Council and its work, particularly its reform efforts; it accused him of wasting the goods and resources of the Church in personal, secular pursuits; and finally it charged him with an uncooperative attitude toward the efforts of the Council in gaining union with the Greeks.[67]

---

[67] John of Segovia, L. XII. c. V, M.C., II, 1005ff; Mansi, XXIX.

One cannot keep from wondering if this last charge was not the most meaningful to the Fathers. Eugene's response was a bull of September 18, 1437, which emphasized the importance of union, noted that the Greeks had agreed to parley with him, and acknowledged the majority party of the Council only to the extent that he discoursed on the unacceptability of Avignon as a site for the pending conference. Finally, he dissolved the Council of Basle, with thirty days' grace to finish its affairs, and summoned its members to Ferrara.[68]

IV. THE MEMBERSHIP

This period has the smallest relative number of incorporations for any of the periods of the Council. The rate of incorporation was only about four-fifths of that for the fourth period, two-thirds of the rate for the second, and less than one-half of the rate for the fifth.[69] Not only was the Council more successful in the previous period, it was more popular.

Since this was a time of nominal amity, or at least peace, between Rome and Basle, the drop in the rate of incorporations again suggests that anti-Romanism, for whatever reasons, was a powerful motive for going to Basle and, since reform activity was most intense in this period, the low rate of incorporations would seem to suggest that this cause was not as popular as is generally assumed. The complexities of these issues are so involved that these conclusions would have to be highly tentative.

---

[68] John of Segovia, L. XII. c. XII, M.C., II, 1033ff.

[69] Appendices, Introduction, Appendix I, Chart II.

Despite the low rate of incorporations, the distribution of the arrivals was wider than in any other period; that is, more areas were represented, and the distribution of Fathers among the representative areas was more even. It is not surprising that this period saw the incorporation of the greatest number of new Fathers from the parts of Italy under papal influence.[70]

There is a remarkable drop in frequency of episcopal and abbatial representation which is much greater than the decline in incorporations generally, but this reflects the very high frequency of the previous period rather than any notable lack in this one. This downward trend will continue steadily throughout the remainder of the Council until there are virtually no men of rank adding themselves to the membership.[71]

The greatest promise of the Council at the beginning of this period contrasts sharply with the failures it produced, and this contrast is complemented by the failure of the European clergy to adhere to the Council in great numbers in its hour of success and opportunity as it had in the earlier time of trial and dispute. Whether this is cause and effect and, if so, which is which is difficult to establish, but it is hard to imagine that success in its chosen activities would not have made the Council more attractive.

---

[70] Appendix I, Chart II.

[71] Appendix II, Section II, Chart III; Section III, Chart III.

CHAPTER V

THE DEPOSITION OF EUGENE IV

(PERIOD IV: OCTOBER, 1437--JUNE, 1439)

The second bull of dissolution was Eugene's last treatment with the Fathers of Basle as a Council. With its issuance he started a systematic campaign to detach support from the meeting at Basle and attach it to himself through the coming Council at Ferrara. Eugene's arguments were significantly different in this attempt to dissolve the Council of Basle from what they had been in his earlier try. The quarrel of 1432-33 had been carried out in terms of a dispute over the proper relationship between Pope and Council with each side claiming superiority. This time Eugene emphasized that he was championing a Council, indeed, the true and proper Council, dedicated to the holy work of union and in possession of the Greek promise to negotiate. His antagonists in Basle, he argued, were simply obstructing the good work that might be done at Ferrara. The claims of papal superiority within the Church were present in the communications through which his campaign was carried on, but the basic message was always a plea for help in the cause of union. This subtle change in tactics left the Fathers of Basle in a very difficult situation. They had made much of the importance of union in the preceding months and the necessity of loyalty and adherence to themselves in order that this holy work might be done. Now it was they who were in the position of obstructionists and spoilers while Eugene advocated cooperation for the good of the faith and Church.

Eugene's success in degrading and ultimately destroying the Council did not lie only in the clever tacking of his diplomatic arguments. The situations of Pope and Council in this struggle are a complete reversal from the ones occupied in their earlier contest in which it was the Fathers who were able to prosecute the negotiations of an important problem while Eugene could only carp and cavil. Then, the Fathers in Basle had the inherent advantages of being physically closer and more intimately familiar with the problem and its ramifications. Proximity allowed the Fathers to pursue a negotiated settlement, and familiarity nurtured their willingness. The success of the Council in substituting disputation and negotiation for armed conflict and its contribution to the eventual settlement of the Bohemian question accrued prestige and support to the Council while Eugene's attempts at obstructionism simply weakened his support and eventually forced him to recognize the Council and its course. In this struggle the advantages lay with Eugene. He had the advantage of physical position, for it was in Italy that the Greeks preferred to meet and discuss their differences with the Western Church. While both parties had been eager to negotiate, it had been

Eugene who had the funds to realize the desire. In the months following his bull of dissolution it was Eugene who could reside in the confidence of his position and prosecute the negotiations which were sure to bring glory and prestige with their success. This time it was the Fathers who were far from the scene of activity and who were reduced to issuing statements denouncing those who were acting and were forced to mutter about points of procedure.

Had the Fathers been willing to acknowledge the right of the Papacy to carry on the negotiations they might have been able to trade the acknowledgement for a share in the proceedings and hence gained a share of the luster while turning their attention to some other profitable area. The actions of the conciliar majority, however, showed that it was willing to destroy the Council rather than work with the Papacy or afford it any independent role in Church affairs. The intransigent anti-Romanism of the conciliar majority was always couched in language which emphasized its devotion to the conciliar ideal as set forth at Constance, but its actions belied its words. The conciliar scheme embodied in Frequens implicitly recognized the necessity of a powerful Papacy as the sustaining organ of the Church; yet the Fathers of Basle were unwilling to grant even the least prerogative to the Pope and were equally reluctant to join with him even in the holy work of union. There is nothing in the conciliarism of

Constance, and it was to Constance that the Basilian Fathers turned for authority, that would justify the degree or variety of the negative anti-Romanism which allowed a majority of the Fathers to insist upon a site for the arrangement of union which they knew was unacceptable to the Greeks. Furthermore, it does not seem too presumptuous to maintain that the conciliar majority would have been willing to yield on the point of who was to prosecute the negotiations with the Greeks rather than risk the destruction of the Council if the success of the Council and conciliarism was their most precious goal. The behavior of the majority on this point would indicate that the Fathers who composed it were more interested in pulling down the position of the Papacy than in elevating that of their Council. Eugene's ignoring of the monition and his bull of September 18th could only drive the Council to more extreme actions. In its twenty-eighth session (October 1, 1437), on the very day when the sixty day period for Eugene's defense expired, the Council declared Eugene guilty of contumacy and gave him another sixty days to answer that charge.[1] There is a basic difference between this act and the one of July. In the earlier summons the Council acted as though it was extending its good offices to Eugene so that he might clear himself of charges made by some unspecified third party.

---

[1] John of Segovia, L. XII. c. XI, M.C., II, 1028ff; Mansi, XXIX, 147ff.

Now the Council was calling him to defend himself against a charge levelled by itself. To be sure, the Council had asserted its supremacy implicitly by summoning Eugene, but now it was publicly asserting itself as the judge of the supreme pontiff. In its twenty-ninth session (October 12, 1437), the Council quashed the papal dissolution of September 18, 1437, an act which asserted its superiority over the Pope, and reiterated Avignon as the only legitimate site for a conference of union.[2]

Despite the concerted efforts of the secular princes without and Cesarini within to conciliate the struggle--a conciliation which amounted to imploring and admonishing the Council to soften its stand and to alter its course--the Council, in its thirty-first session (January 24, 1438), suspended Eugene from his office, entrusted the headship of the Church to a committee of its members, and ordered Eugene to appear before itself.[3] Of course, Eugene ignored this. He had attended the opening of his Council in Ferrara just a few days earlier and had witnessed the endorsement by it, in the first session (January 10, 1438), of his bull of September 18th.[4]

---

[2] John of Segovia, L. XII. c. XIV, M.C., II, 1028ff; Mansi, XXIX, 147ff.

[3] John of Segovia, L. XIII. c. VII, M.C., III, 25ff; Mansi, XXIX, 165ff.

[4] John of Segovia, L. XIII. c. III, M.C., III, 8ff.

No prince openly opposed the suspension of Eugene, but few endorsed it. Most of them maintained a strict neutrality. The lack of secular support, however, did not deter the Fathers, and, after the various time periods granted to Eugene had elapsed, they declared, in their thirty-fifth session (June 25, 1439), that Gabriel, formerly Pope Eugene IV, was a rebel against authority, a violator of canons, a destroyer of the peace, a notorious scandalizer of the Church, a simoniac, perjurer, and schismatic,[5] and therefore was removed, deposed, deprived, and dismissed from the Papacy and Roman Pontificate.[6] At this time the city and Council of Basle were struck by plague.

The whole behavior of the Council from their loss of the Greek negotiations to this point and on to their election of an Antipope presents the aspect of a charade. Its actions are overdrawn and awkward and played without substance or backdrop. Each step in the drama is more extreme, shows less cognizance of the practical situation, and contains less likelihood of meaningful accomplishment. With each act the contrast with the skill and purpose of the earlier days became more marked. The Council has changed, and with this change the dynamics which created and maintained it are altered; and with this alteration the Council changes even more. The change-begetting changes are reflected in the nature of the men who came to be incorporated into it and the goals they sought through it. The first clear example of what the Council had become and was to become even more is seen in an aspect of Eugene's deposition. It is characteristic of what the Council was becoming that we must start our understanding in a place removed from Basle and with an issue outside the Church. On February 2, 1435, Joanna II of Naples died without an heir, and a long and involved succession struggle was begun. Alfonso V of Aragon had once been designated as her successor as a reward for political services, but Joanna later found it advantageous to visit the same distinction on Louis II, Duke of Anjou. In her will, Joanna named René of Anjou, son of the now-deceased Louis, as her heir. Hence there arose a struggle between the House of Anjou and the Kingdom of Aragon for the crown of Naples, a struggle which the Pontiff of Rome, the ruler of the Patrimony of St. Peter, could hardly avoid. René gained papal support by supplying men to help Eugene against the Sforza condottiere, and a Papal-Angevin entente created a Milanese-Aragonese counterforce and the lines were drawn.[7] Alfonso spared no efforts or resources to overcome his opponents and gain his objective, so it is not surprising that he undertook to capitalize upon the animosity between Eugene and the Council to further his ends.

---

[5] Later, on July 2, 1439, the Council added heretic to the list. John of Segovia, L. XX. c. XVII, M.C., III, 331.

[6] John of Segovia, L. XV. c. XV, M.C., III, 325; Mansi, XXIX, 179.

---

[7] The situation in Italy is presented in the Cambridge Medieval History (Cambridge: 1936), VIII, The Close of the Middle Ages, ch. V. "The Papacy and Naples in the Fifteenth

It is well established through the work of Preiswerk and Schwiezer that Alfonso used his influence to encourage the Council to take its extreme stands and then supported them in order to embarrass Eugene. The prosecutor of Aragonese policy at the Council was Nicholas Tudeschi, Archbishop of Palermo and later a Cardinal of Felix V, who was very active in conciliar affairs from his arrival at the Council in December, 1436, to its eventual dissolution and who was very active in the anti-papal or, considering his principal, anti-Eugenian camp.[8]

What is not noted in the studies of this matter is that a remarkable and significant increase in the numbers of Aragonese clerics incorporated into the Council is seen during the period from Eugene's dissolution of the Council until his deposition by it. In the previous periods the incorporation

---

Century," ch. XV, "Spain, 1412-1516." See particularly pages 164ff, 483ff. For its application in the context of the Council see N. Valois, Le Pape et le Concile, II, 148ff; E. Preiswerk, Der Einfluss Aragons auf dem Prozess des Basler Konzils gegen Eugen IV (Basel: 1902); J. Schwiezer, Nikolaus de Tudeschi und seine Tätigkeit am basler Konzil (Basel: 1924).

[8] There are over three hundred fifty references to Tudeschi in John of Segovia's Historia.

records show only four per cent of the new arrivals coming from Aragon, but in this, the fourth period, Aragon accounts for almost fifteen per cent.[9] This quadrupling of the relative numbers of Aragonese among the incorporations does not result from a decline in numbers from other areas but from an absolute increase of 130 per cent which, because of the shorter timespan of this period, amounts to a relative increase of 330 per cent.[10] This would seem to indicate that in Aragon the crown could mobilize the clergy, or some part of it, to serve a policy of state and even send a considerable number of clerics half way across Europe to pursue it. If Haller is right and the Fathers' basic purpose in participating in the Council, or at least in its reform aspect, was to further the ends of their princes, we see nothing new here except that this issue was of less general concern than had been the issues surrounding reform. On the other hand, the use of the Council for such a specific, secular end must have weakened it in its struggle to regain the initiative from Eugene and to repair the harm done by the schism.

We must be careful not to overemphasize the role of Aragon, however, for if one out of seven new arrivals in this period was Aragonese, six were not. Over 60 per cent of the new Fathers were still French or German[11] and the political relations of these areas with the Council were changing, too.

---

[9] Appendix I, Chart III.

[10] _Ibid_.

The declaration of Eugene's contumacy was received uneasily by the Emperor and the Electors in Germany because they rightly felt that this might be the opening wedge of schism. At the Frankfurt *Tag* of the Electoral College on November 3, 1437, the Electors tried vainly to work out a plan for peace, and in so doing they took the first steps toward the policy of neutrality that they were to adopt later.[12] The death of Sigismund on December 9, 1437, delayed any further formation of an imperial policy until the meeting of the Electors in March, 1438, at Frankfurt, by which time the Council's suspension of Eugene had taken place and the situation had worsened. At that time the Electors announced a strict neutrality toward Pope and Council and pursuant to it they would defer recognition of the official acts of either until an undesignated later date, and they would take to themselves the overseeing of the Church in their lands until such a time as the new Emperor could resolve the situation. The next day the Electors chose Albert of Austria, Sigismund's son-in-law, as Emperor.

---

[11] *Ibid*.

[12] The basic studies of German neutrality are Gertrud Weber, *Die selbständige Vermittlungs politik der Kurfürsten im Konflikt zwischen Papst und Konzil, 1437-38* (Berlin), and Adolph Bachmann, "Die deutschen Könige und die Kurfürstliche Neutralität (1438-1447): Ein Beitrag zur Reichs - und Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands. Mit urkundlichen Beilagen," *Archiv fur österreichische Geschichte*, bd. 75., 1889. The details of the various declarations of the Diet, Electoral College, etc., are presented in *H-L*, VII, pt, 2, 1061ff. The impact of neutrality on the behavior of churchmen in Germany is presented in detail in H. Stutt, *Die nordwestdeutschen Diözesen und das Baseler Konzil in den Jahren 1431-1441* (Erlangen; 1928), and C. Hanna, *Die sudwestdeutschen Diözesen und das Baseler Konzil in den Jahren 1431 bis 1441* (Borna-Leipzig: 1929). For the Frankfurt *Tag*, see Bachmann, 14ff.

France had already decided on a similar course; indeed, it had been decided that the situation was serious enough to justify a Gallican synod even before the suspension of Eugene by the Council.[13] The gathering was called for May 1, 1434, at Bourges, and on June 7th the fruits of the deliberations were promulgated as a Pragmatic Sanction by Charles VII. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges was only the acceptance of the reform decrees of the Council of Basle, with slight modifications to accommodate the peculiarities of the Gallican Church, and an endorsement of _Frequens_ with the express reservation of comment about the superiority of Councils over the Papacy, and the decrees affirming the legitimacy of the Council of Basle.[14] However, Valois makes it clear that the ready acceptance of these decrees in France was due to their harmony with the traditional development of the Church in France rather than the prestige or power of the Council.[15] Indeed, France was as eager as Germany to avoid involvement in the current struggle and, like Germany, was eager to maintain a posture of neutrality but still eager to reap the benefits of the reform decrees.

---

[13] The basic work on the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges is N. Valois, _Histoire de la Pragmatique Sanction de Bourges sous Charles VII_ (Paris: 1906). For the origins of the synod at Bourges, see Valois, lxxviii. Hefele, VII, 2, 1053, implies strongly that the synod resulted directly from the Council's suspension of Eugene, and Creighton, III, 6, flatly states that France was following the German example.

[14] _H-L_, VII, pt. 2, 1056ff.

In Germany the decision about the reforms of the Council was delayed until March 26, 1439, when an Imperial Diet at Mainz adopted an "Instrument of Acceptation" very similar to the Pragmatic Sanction and simultaneously reaffirmed German neutrality.[16]

The political neutrality of France and Germany did not affect the freedom of their clerics to participate in the Council and the incorporation records show nothing but a continuation of the relative intensity of interest established in the earlier periods. There was even a small increase in the percentage of the total arrivals from Germany.[17]

Among the arrivals generally there was a modest increase of relative numbers over the preceding period even if the high numbers from Aragon are discounted. The frequency of bishops and abbots and their proctors among the arrivals in this period, however, dropped precipitously. Abbatial representation among the arrivals decreased to 65 per cent of the level of the third period and to 32 per cent of that of the second[18] while the level of frequency of bishops and their proctors was only 36 per cent of that for the third period and 11 per cent of the second.[19] The level of incorporation of parish priests increased 50 per cent, but the numbers were still small.[20]

---

[15] Valois, lxvii ff.

[16] Bachmann, 46ff.

[17] Appendix I, Chart III.

---

[18] Appendix II, Section III, Chart III.

[19] Appendix II, Section II, Chart III.

[20] Appendix II, Section IV, Chart III.

CHAPTER VI

THE END OF THE COUNCIL

I. THE ELEVATION OF FELIX V

The selection and installation of a successor to Eugene dominated the Council for the full year following his deposition. The problems of how and who were difficult. The only Cardinal still participating in the Council was Louis d'Allemand, Archbishop of Arles and, since the departure of Cesarini, the President of the Council. It was clear that some electoral apparatus had to be created, yet this was almost a canonical and practical impossibility. The election of the Pope by a two-thirds vote of the Cardinals had been unquestioned for over two and a half centuries, and the practices and procedures of the conclave had been fixed since 1274. To be sure, Constance had selected Martin V by *ad hoc* procedures, but Constance had twenty-three Cardinals among its members; it had enjoyed the support of virtually all of Europe; and it had successfully voided the claims of the three original claimants.[1] Basle had none of these advantages. To worsen matters, the Council was paralyzed by a terrible plague which had brought new incorporations to an all time low in July, August, and September; had forced most of the Fathers to flee the city; and had killed many who refused to go or who lingered too long.[2]

---

[1] Hugo Manger, *Die Wahl Amadeo's von Savoyen zum Päpste durch das Basler Konzil, 1439* (Marburg: 1901), 23. Martin was selected by six committees, the attendant Cardinals and committees of six members from each of the five nations. A two-thirds vote of each committee was required to elect.

The coming of the Autumn frost allowed the Council to resume its work. It was decided that the electors would be the one Cardinal, d'Allemand, and thirty-two council members of sufficient rank and character to qualify for the cardinalate under the reform of the Sacred College which had been decreed in the Council's twenty-third session. The selection of the papal electors was to be done by a committee chosen by the Council. Almost the entire month of October was consumed in selecting this committee, for it was felt that the committee should be as small as possible--three was the proposed number--so that the least possibility of disagreement might arise, but all of the attendant nationalities clamored for inclusion. Finally, a committee of John Dundrennan, a Scot; John of

---

[2] Among the victims of the plague were Alexander, Abbot of Vezelay, the first of the Fathers to arrive in 1431; John, Bishop of Lübeck, who had led the embassy of the Council to Avignon and Constantinople in 1438; and Louis, Patriarch of Aquileia, a strong partisan of the Council who was instrumental in defeating a motion by d'Allemand on September 29, 1439, to adjourn the Council until November 2nd. John of Segovia, L. XV. c. XX, M.C., III, 339ff; L. XVI. c. VIII, M.C., III, 429. For the impact of the plague on the Council, see Manger, 14ff.

Segovia, a Spaniard; and Thomas of Courcelles, a Frenchman, was agreed upon with the provision that they consult the spokesmen from the German and Italian nations.[3]

The general congregation of October 28, 1439, at which the names of the papal electors were to be announced, was marked by suspense and apprehension, but the committee had done its work well, and it presented a roster which was universally well received. In addition to d'Allemand, the electoral commission was composed of eight men from each of the Italian, French, German, and Spanish nations and it included an Archbishop, ten bishops, seven abbots, and nine doctors and five masters of theology. The seeming ecumenicism of this group is denied and the new shape of the Council is foreshadowed when it is noted that seven of the eight Spaniards were Aragonese and of these five had arrived in the preceding eighteen months. Furthermore, all eight of the Italians were Savoyards who had arrived in the previous June or within the month, and two of the Frenchmen were likewise Savoyards.[4]

---

[3] Manger, 24ff.

[4] In addition to d'Allemand the electors were: Italy - William Diderio, Bishop of Vercelli; George de Saluzzo, Bishop of Aosta; John de Parella, Bishop of Ivrea; Louis Ursini de Romagnano, Bishop of Turin; Aleran de Carreto, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery of St. Beningnus Fructuarius in the diocese of Ivrea; Jacob, Abbot of Susa in the diocese of Turin; John of Monte Canuta, Superior of the House of St. Antonius de Renverso in the diocese of Turin, Doctor Decretorum; Bartholomew de Provanis, Superior of the House of St. Antonius

The next day, October 30th, the electors entered their conclave and, after four votes, announced on November 5th their election of Amadeus VIII, Duke of Savoy. There had been no contest in the conclave because Amadeus was the only man in Christendom who fulfilled the two essential requisites for the post: a record of sympathy, loyalty, and support to the Council and sufficient material means to support the office and, hopefully, to further the Council.[5]

---

de Clavacro in the diocese of Ivrea, Doctor Decretorum; France - John d'Arsy, Archbishop of Tarentaise; Franciscus de Meez, Bishop of Geneva; Bernard de la Planche, Bishop of Aix in Aquitaine; Raymond, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Concques in the diocese of Rodez, Province of Bourges; Nicholas Thibout, Penitentiary of Coutances, Master of Theology; John de Valle Brito, Rector of the parish church of Plenvor in the diocese of Leon, Master of Theology; William Hugonis, Archdeacon of Metz, Doctor Legum; Germany - Frederick zu Rhein, Bishop of Basle; Conrad, Abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Klein Lützel bei Basle; Thomas of Scotland, Abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Dundrennan in the diocese of Witthorn-Galloway; Dezelas, Archdeacon of Craçow, Doctor Decretorum; Henry de Judaeis of Cologne, Doctor Legum; Jacob of Salzburg, Canon of Regensburg, Licentiatus in iure canonico; Christian von Königingraetz, Prior of St. Peters in Brunn, diocese of Olmütz, Master of Theology; Spain - Otto de Moncada, Bishop of Tortosa; George de Ornos, Bishop of Vich; Louis de Amaral, Bishop of Vizeu; Peter, Abbott of the Benedictine monastery of St. Cucufas in the diocese of Barcelona; Anthony, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Arula in the diocese of Elne; Bernard de Bosco, Canon of Lerida, Doctor Decretorum; Raymond Albioli, Canon of Tarazona, Doctor Decretorum; John of Segovia, Archdeacon of Oviedo, Master of Theology. This list is taken from Manger, 38ff, who has reconciled some modest contradictions in the sources. The analysis of the electors on the basis of incorporation dates and political obedience is my own. Note that Scotland is attached to the German nation. At Constance it was counted with the French. The English nation is not included because there were no Englishmen in attendance.

[5] A full discussion of this is found in Manger, 47ff.

The selection of a layman was extraordinary, but Amadeus was an extraordinary man. He had succeeded his father at the age of eight in 1391, and seven years later he assumed the governance of his lands. In the following years he capitalized on the distress of his neighbors until Savoy stretched from the Rhone to the headwaters of the Po and from the Mediterranean to Lake Geneva. In 1416 he arranged the elevation of Savoy to the dignity of a duchy. All of this was done through diplomacy with a minimal recourse to arms.[6]

In 1431 Amadeus's eldest son died, and according to one tradition this loss and the earlier death of his wife led him, three years later, to enter the life of a religious recluse. With six companions he retired to the ducal castle at Ripaille on Lake Geneva where he styled his group the Order of St. Maurice after a local martyr. A less friendly explanation for his embracing this quasi-monastic life comes from Aeneas Sylvius who visited Ripaille in 1435 and who says that even then Amadeus was scheming to become Pope.[7]

---

[6] Manger, 57ff.

[7] Sylvius Aeneas, _Commentarrii rerum memorabilium_. For an interpretation of Amadeus in this light see W. Boulton, _Aeneas Silvius, Orator, Man of Letters, Statesman, and Pope_ (London: 1908), and Valois II, 187. The more sympathetic view is developed by T. v. d. Mühll, _Vorspiel zur Zeitenwende_ (Munich: 1959). See also M. Bruchet, _Le Chateau de Ripaille_ (Paris: 1907). Manger 58ff presents the arguments on both sides and concludes that Amadeus's motives cannot be established.

Regardless of his aim, Amadeus received a call to the Papacy, or at least a call of a sort, through an imposing procession which left Basle for Ripaille on December 3, 1439. It included d'Allemand, seven bishops, four abbots, six doctors and four masters of theology, a count, a baron, and the Provincial Commander of the German Order in Alsace, and with retainers it counted two hundred seventy mounted men.[8] The embassy arrived at Ripaille on December 15th where four days were required to gain an acceptance from Amadeus.[9]

The following months were occupied with preparation for the papal coronation, the many details of the relationship of the new Pope and the Council, and the definition of Amadeus's perquisites and responsibilities. It became apparent very early in the negotiations that Amadeus had no intention of expending sizable sums to shore the Council. He was willing to support the embassy bringing him the news of his election or to pay for his coronation,[10] but he was not willing to contribute funds to the Council on a sustaining basis, nor did he intend to support his own office or curia. Indeed, the embassy to Ripaille had to promise the restoration of annates to gain his acceptance of the office.[11] As it turned out and as Amadeus must have been aware, the assumption of the papal revenues by himself really meant that the moneys flowing to Rome from Savoy (for no other land was sufficiently obedient to send money) would be retained in ducal hands and, given the frugality with which he played his new role, the House of Savoy probably made a profit from his election. In any event, the many details were worked out by midsummer, and Amadeus was crowned as Felix V on July 24, 1440.[12]

---

[8] John of Segovia, L. XVI. c. XIII, M.C., III, 449; Manger, 70ff. A. Eckstein, Zur Finanzlage des Basler Konzils (Berlin: 1911), 29f., places the number of the embassy at three hundred forty-seven, but he fails to cite his source.

[9] Manger, 73ff. The issues discussed were not weighty. Amadeus wished a modest change in his oath and to be allowed to maintain his recluse's life, complete with habit and beard. He also wanted to retain his name, Amadeus, after becoming Pope. He yielded on all of these. Manger feels that these points were for the sake of appearance.

[10] Eckstein, 30; Manger, 77ff.

The reaction of the Papacy to the election and coronation of the Antipope was relatively restrained and predictable. The Council's election of a man so manifestly from the world and the general success of Eugene in his diplomatic campaign against the Council made the papal role easy. The Council's decree of the fortieth session (February26, 1440) excommunicating all who refused obedience to Felix[13] evoked a similar response from the Pope on March 23rd.[14] The creation by Eugene in December, 1439, of seventeen cardinals, only five of whom were Italians, probably was a maneuver to strengthen his position against the Council.[15] Otherwise, Eugene simply issued statements denouncing and expressing shock over the doings at Basle.

---

[11] Manger, 79ff. This issue was raised by Amadeus after he had accepted. The funds were granted to him by the Council in its forty-second session (August 4, 1440) but it was only a part of the full annates and was clearly marked as payment in lieu of the revenues from the Patrimony of St. Peter. John of Segovia, L. XVI. c. XXX., M.C., III, 498ff. This decree is interesting because it is one of the few instances where we get any hint of how the Fathers felt the Pope should finance his office. It is reminiscent of the old medieval attitude that the king should "live of his own" which was so important in the development of parliament in England.

[12] John of Segovia, L. XXVII. c. XXVIII, M.C., III, 494.

The success of Eugene's diplomacy and perhaps a general tiring of the European clergy and laity with the Council are reflected in the incorporations of new members in this period. The level of new members coming from France dropped to 70 per cent of what it had been in the earlier periods, and the number of Germans was noticeably below what it had been even in the nadir of the third period.[16]

The frequency of French and Germans among the incorporations at large was also lessened, in the case of the former to about 35 per cent of what they had been in the other periods and in the latter by a somewhat less spectacular drop, but still to a level markedly lower than ever before. These two areas together supplied less than 43 per cent of the new arrivals which compares with 58 per cent, 53 per cent, and 61 per cent respectively for the three previous periods.[17]

---

[13] John of Segovia, L. XVI. c. XVIII, M.C., III, 465ff.

[14] Mansi, XXXIa, 238.

[15] Creighton, III, 24.

[16] Appendix I, Chart III.

The drops in the rates of incorporation for French and German clerics afford a striking contrast to the general level of incorporations in this period which saw the highest relative numbers of incorporations of any period of the Council. The deficiencies of numbers from France and Germany were offset by remarkable increases from Savoy and Brittany. The rate of incorporations from these two areas increased to 350 per cent of what it had been in any previous period and over one-third of the new members came from them. These two areas had never accounted for more than 9 per cent in any previous period.[18]

The reason for the increased interest of the Savoyards in the Council is obvious since the sole concern of the Fathers in this period was the election of their Duke as the Supreme Pontiff. The increased interest of the Bretons, however, is more surprising, and to understand it we must look, as in the case of Aragon, to events outside the Council.[19]

---

[17] Ibid. [18] Ibid.

[19] E. Vaucelle, "La Bretagne et le concile de Bâle," Annales de Saint-Louis-des-Francais, X^{e}anee, 1905, 485-572. The article occupies pages 485-535. The remainder presents pertinent documents.

John V, Duke of Brittany, was a capable ruler, secure in his own lands. The geographical position of his duchy had thrust him into the center of the now chronic war between France and England, but the nature and history of his lands and his own turn of mind determined his role as that of mediator rather than a participant in the struggle. Brittany was a land whose boundaries were determined more by the language and customs of its people than by the ambitions of its prince, and the customary aim of Breton foreign policy was to avoid incorporation into France rather than the expansion of its borders. John was well suited to the rule of such a land and the prosecution of such a policy. He was a pious, moderate man whose only active foreign policy was the arbitration of the war around him and who sought in ecclesiastical affairs only a well functioning Church which would tend the spiritual needs of his people, reflect their customs and ways, and not be utilized as an avenue for French infiltration. In the Breton mind these three aims formed a harmonious unity, with the latter two being essential to the first.[20]

Conciliarism and the Council of Basle were attractive neither to Breton clergy nor to Duke John. To be sure, John was eager for reform and simplification of the Church, but any thoughts of gaining these through the Council were quieted by a letter from Eugene dated July 6, 1432, and assuring John that these aims would be served best by remaining loyal to the Holy See which would attend to the ills of the Church as soon as the obstreperous malcontents at Basle were dealt with.[21] John did not forbid his clergy from going to Basle as Eugene wished, nor did he command them to go as the Council urged,[22] but in point of fact very few bothered to go.[23]

---

[20] *Ibid.*, 487ff

The recognition of the Council by Eugene in January, 1434, enabled John to recognize the Council and in March, 1434, his embassy arrived. This arrival precipitated a crisis of protocol which was monumental even for a period with the highly developed code of honor of the late middle ages. The matter arose over a honorific seating of the embassy which maintained its precedence over that of the Duke of Burgundy and, in turn, caused the representatives of all the secular princes to reconsider the dignity of their receptions and placement in the Council. This matter consumed the energies of the Council until July when everyone was finally seated in an acceptable spot.[24] Lobineau, the great chronicler of Brittany, says, disparagingly, that this was the most significant issue at Basle for Brittany.[25] Perhaps it was, but the reverse is not true.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, 488. [22] Mansi, XXXIX, 207.

[23] Appendix I, Chart III.

[24] Vaucelle, 493ff; John of Segovia, L. VI. cc. XL-XLIII, *M.C.*, III, 543ff.

For many months a delicate situation had been developing in Brittany. The Pope had reserved the See of St. Mâlo for one Pierre Piedru, Bishop of Treguier, and had reserved Treguier for Raoul Rolland. The chapter of St. Malo had elected Rolland. Piedru was a Frenchman who neither spoke nor understood Breton. Rolland was a close friend and advisor of John and an important figure in Brittany. The problem was further complicated by the fact that St. Mâlo was an episcopal city of great strategic importance, and many felt that Piedru's translation would deliver the city to the French and, at best, could compromise Brittany's neutrality or, at worst, might lead to French annexation. The whole issue was forced by the death of the Bishop of St. Mâlo in August, 1434. The following November John presented the matter to the Council for adjudication, and it was decided that Eugene had acted contrary to canons.[26] Their decision is an adumbration of the reforms decreed the following June. A complex conciliation of the parties by Eugene, however, gained for him his end. This affair did not drive John from his obedience to Eugene but it did not strengthen it; and it did prepare a sympathetic ear for the conciliar reforms of the coming months.[27]

---

[25] D. Lobineau, *Histoire de Bretagne* (Paris: 1707; two volumes), II, 588.

[26] Vaucelle, 514; John of Segovia, L. IX. c. XXX, *M.C.*, III, 823.

The Breton clergy and government were still not attracted to Basle,and only a few Bretons went to Basle where their role in forging the reforms and negotiating with the Greeks was negligible. Indeed, the evidence indicates that John and the Breton clergy returned to a close union with Eugene during this period. Although there is no indication of John's denying the Council it seems that his conduct was satisfactory to Eugene since, in January, 1438, John was given the right of nomination to certain reserved benefices in recognition of "the constancy of his faith and devotion to the person of the Pope and the Holy See." At the same time and without request John was relieved of a vow he had taken on the occasion of his wife's death to enter the Dominican order. Eugene said that John could best serve the faith by remaining in his office and furthering the cause of peace between his neighbors.[28] Further evidence of good relations between John and Eugene is seen later in the year when Eugene imposed a tithe to further the cause of union; i.e., to pay for the Council of Florence, the notice of which was received in Brittany in September, 1438, and the moneys were delivered in January, 1439.[29]

---

[27] Vaucelle, 515ff.

[28] *Ibid.*, 518

[29] *Ibid.*, 519.

The good relations were not to last, for in January, 1439, Eugene again reserved a Breton See, St. Brieuc, to a Frenchman. John protested by citing the Council's decrees on this issue, decrees which had recently been sustained in France through the Pragmatic Sanction. Eugene's reply to the objection was a haughty letter sermonizing about papal power and prerogative which flouted the decrees of Basle and the interests of Brittany.[30] A copy of this letter was forwarded to Basle, by whom it is not clear,where it was duly noted and was contributory to the charge of heresy levelled against Eugene in the aftermath of his deposition.[31]

It is at this very moment, in May, 1439, that we note the beginnings of the remarkable increase in Bretons among the arrivals. The role of John in this is not clear. There is no record of his ordering or encouraging his clergy to go to Basle, though he must have been aware that they were going. Apparently the Bretons still found little at Basle because they seem to have played no prominent role in the Council; the Pope got his way with the See of St. Brieuc; the Council did nothing about the situation; and their incorporations cease almost completely with the coronation of Felix V.[32]

---

[30] Ibid., 522.

[31] John of Segovia, L. XV. c. XVI, M.C., III, 327.

[32] Appendix I, Chart II.

The brief enthusiasm for the Council in Brittany, then, would seem to have been nothing but a pointless, aberrant expression of frustration at the disregard shown by Eugene toward Breton self interest and ecclesiastical order. In another light, it might be regarded as an instance of revolt against the general papal disregard for local conditions and considerations,the continuance of which was to destroy the centralized papal authority in the next century. In the context of the Council, the curious Breton behavior meant nothing but the introduction of a sizable number of insignificant clerics[33] to fill the seats during conciliar deliberations. The numbers, however, were important since the size of the Council would be taken as a reflection of its ecumenical character,and the Breton influx more than offset the dwindling numbers from elsewhere.

The ranks and offices of the new arrivals is significant. All of the five bishops incorporated in this period were Savoyard,and well over one-third of the arrivals were parish priests. Indeed, 58 per cent of the parish clerics incorporated into the Council were incorporated during this period.[34]

The humble quality and narrow diversity among the geographical origins of the new Fathers are better indices of what the Council was in this period than is the rate of incorporations. This rate was higher than that for any other period, but an analysis of the new arrivals shows them to be men of lower rank from polities with specific causes to be pursued. The Council had become an absurd extension of the scheme of Frequens by its ever broadening arrogation of authority without even a vestige of power. Peace, reform, and reunion were ideals to be realized by practical measures in a practical world, and the Council left the practical world with its absurd insistence upon meeting with the Greeks at Avignon where the Greeks refused to go. This flirtation with fantasy developed into a regular liaison with the deposition of Eugene and the election of Amadeus. The Council had abandoned the meaningful pursuit of its original goals and in this period degenerated to an instrument for the advancement of petty, local policies.

---

[33] There was not a single bishop or abbot among the Bretons,and over two-thirds of them were parish priests.

[34] Appendix II, Section IV, Chart II.

II. THE EPILOG

(PERIOD IV: AUGUST, 1440--AUGUST, 1443)

Although it would be almost another decade before the last remnant of the Council would dissolve itself, the election of Amadeus ended the meaningful existence of the Council. The Antipope and the Council threw their resources and energies into a last effort to vitalize their position through a vain attempt to regain the recognition of the German Electors and the Emperor, now Frederick III who was elected to succeed Albert in February, 1440. At a series of diets and conferences there were monumental debates between the protagonists of Eugene and those of the Council and Felix, but the Germans were not moved, and they adhered to their neutrality punciliously until the diplomatic skill of Aeneas Sylvius restored the German obedience to Rome in 1447.[35]

Felix was quick to realize that the cause of the Council was beyond saving, but he also saw that the indistinct dignity it had given him could be exploited for the benefit of his dynasty and lands. Hence, after the failure of the Council's diplomatic offensive in Germany in 1443, he withdrew to Lausanne, slowly extricated himself from the Council, and made what arrangements he could to further his personal ends.[36]

Both the Council and its Pope ceased to become forces in European affairs and slowly their interests became involved in local, Swiss affairs. Most notable is their involvement in the attempts of Frederick III to regain the Hapsburg lands now held by the Swiss Confederacy. The Council was instrumental, through the extension of its good offices, in minimizing the bloodshed in this matter.[37]

---

[35] Creighton, III, ch. X, XI, contain a masterful presentation of the struggle for German obedience.

[36] Mühll, 175ff; J. Stutz, Felix V und die Schweiz (Fribourg: 1930).

[37] Stutz, passim; E. Fechter, "Basel im Kriege gegen die Armagnaken," Basler Taschenbuch (1862).

The incorporations of new members reflect the course of the Council. In the three and a half years between the coronation of Felix and the end of our records in December, 1443, there were one hundred twenty incorporations, ninety-four of which occurred before the end of 1441, and over one-quarter of which were of Savoyards.[38]

---

[38] The precise distribution of the arrivals for this period are: Vienne, 13 (12); Milan, 13 (8); Besancon, 12 (9); Mainz, S., 11 (7); Salzburg, 10 (8); Mainz, N., 9 (5); Cologne, 8 (8); Gnesen, 7 (5); Lyons, 4 (4); Italy, 4 (2); Tarentaise, 4 (3); Aquileia, 3 (3); Tarragona, 3 (3); Pomerania, 2 (2); Auch, 2 (2), Toulouse, 2 (2); Prague, 2 (1); Riga, 1 (1); Magdeburg, 1 (1); Bourges, 1 (1); Sens, 1 (1); Tours, 1 (1); Aix 1; Treves, 1 (1). The numbers in parentheses denote the incorporations before the end of 1441.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

I. A SUMMARY

The patterns in which the members arrived at the Council of Basle are very clear and are complementary to its general course. Throughout the first year, 1431, and the early months of 1432, hardly anyone was on hand to participate in the Council, and not even the arrival in September, 1431, of the legate and president, Julian Cardinal Cesarini, made any immediate difference. The Council had to advertise widely for members and ask papal support in its recruiting efforts. In November, 1431, the paucity of members and, later, the Council's negotiations with the Hussites were sufficient justification for Eugene to attempt its dissolution. The announcement of this act to the Fathers in January, 1432, only inspired them to continue, and they organized their Council for deliberative and administrative purposes and prosecuted their negotiations with the Hussites with all the skill and vigor they possessed.

This resolution to persevere in the face of papal forbiddance evoked from the European clergy a sympathetic and positive response which was reflected in an increase in the numbers of clerics who presented themselves for incorporation into the Council. They came in remarkably even numbers from the various parts of Europe and in sufficient frequency in the higher ranks to allow the Council to carry on its affairs with the necessary prestige and decorum.

The success of the Council in progressing toward a settlement in Bohemia was well received, and this success forced Eugene, whose will to resist was sapped by his Italian problems, to give full recognition to the Council. This recognition, which seemingly would have secured the Council's position in every sense, was really the beginning of the Council's destruction. The two tasks now assumed by the Council -- reunion with the Greeks and reform of the Church--were simply beyond it. It could not match the resources or diplomatic skill of the Papacy in bidding for the privilege of dealing with the Greeks, and the product of the reform effort was limited to the paring of the administrative and fiscal practices of the Papacy to the advantage of the episcopacy and hence to the advantage of the secular princes.

This period saw a general diminution in the numbers of new members but a broadening of the Council's geographic base. This latter characteristic was probably the result of papal recognition (it certainly was the reason for the appearance of new members from papal Italy) while the cause of the general lessening of arrivals is less clear. It suggests, however, that the generalized clergy of Europe found a Council devoted to basic problems less attractive than the one locked in battle with the Papacy, or, to put it another way, it was not conciliarism so much as anti-papalism which attracted men to Basle. This anti-papalism was expressed clearly in 1436 and 1437 by the refusal of the conciliar majority to accept an Italian site for the discussions of union with the Greeks because of its fear that any talks in Italy would be dominated by Eugene. The ridiculous insistence by the majority that the talks be held in Avignon, even though the Greeks had announced that they would not appear, rent the Council, and the minority party agreed upon an Italian site. Eugene quickly recognized the minority as the pars sanior and again dissolved the Council. This schism among the Fathers and its exploitation by the Pope was the end of the Council as a pan-European body.

Haller's interpretation of the reform work of the Council, which argues that the guiding aim of the Fathers was as much the enlargement of secular, princely power as it was the limitation of papal prerogative, presents the Council as an arena for the confrontation of secular particularism and spiritual universalism. This view has never been fully investigated nor systematically presented, but it offers an explanation for the curious limits of the reform efforts. It also prepares us to understand the curious limits of the Council's membership in its later years.

The numbers of arrivals from all parts of Europe began to increase almost immediately with the renewal of the struggle between Rome and Basle, but the influx from the Kingdom of Aragon was particularly marked. Aragonese representation until this time had been very slight, but it increased phenomenally with the deepening involvement of Alfonso V in the general scramble for the throne of Naples which aligned him against Eugene. Aragon did not come to dominate the Council, and there is nothing unique about Italian politics becoming confounded with ecclesiastical affairs. Indeed, Philip-Marie Visconti had seen the Council as a vehicle of Milanese policy in 1432-33, and this interest was reflected in the incorporation records of the time. The significant aspect of the Aragonese incorporations is that they adumbrate the pattern of incorporations in the next period and signal the metamorphosis of the Council from a representative assembly of the European *ecclesia* into an instrument of ephemeral, particular, state policy.

The Council's folly in suspending and deposing Eugene IV and its madness in electing and crowning Amadeus of Savoy as Felix V marked the end of the drama which had begun with the conciliar schism of early 1437. France, through the Gallican synod of Bourges, and Germany, through the Electors and the Diet, formally declared their non-involvement in this struggle while carefully accepting the conciliar reforms which extended their secular power. Most of the other areas of Europe retreated from involvement with the Council just as really if not as formally.

This withdrawal is seen in the incorporation records by the general lessening of numbers while the two exceptions to this general pattern--Savoy and Brittany--supplied enough new members to make this period of fantasy the most numerous in incorporations even if the numbers were drawn from the lowest ranks of the clergy. Savoy, with its Duke about to be crowned as the Supreme Pontiff, and Brittany, with its sense of ecclesiastical and ethnic integrity affronted, were not interested in the deeper problems of the Church but with their own problems and policies.

The Council withered to nothing in the months following the coronation of Felix, and it commanded obedience only from Savoy. Now the new members came seldom, but the Council clung to life through a handful of men, many of whom had quite literally given the best years of their lives to the Council and its ideals. It managed to remain in existence long enough to see the death of Eugene. His successor, Nicholas V, was able to convince the Fathers of Basle, now resident in Lausanne, that the time had come to adjourn, and on April 5, 1449, the remnant met for the last time and terminated the Council without designating a site for a successor.

II. A COMPARISON OF THE MEMBERSHIPS OF THE COUNCILS OF BASLE AND CONSTANCE

The demise of conciliarism through the failure of the

Fathers of Basle contrasts sharply with its creation through the successes of the Fathers of Constance, and it is fortunate that the work of Josef Riegel[1] allows us to make a limited comparison of the membership of these two Councils. The comparison is difficult because the Councils differed so in length and character and because the composition and nature of the Council of Basle differed so from the earlier to the later periods. Hence, the comparisons will be drawn between the whole of the Council of Constance and the second and third periods (March, 1432, through September, 1437) of Basle and again with its third and fourth periods (October, 1437, through July, 1440).

According to Riegel, a total of 1,227 clerics participated in the Council of Constance, or about 350 per year for its three and a half years. The five and a half years of the second and third periods at Basle saw about 1,425 incorporations, or some 250 per year, while the two and three-fourths of the next two periods saw the incorporations of about 950 new members, or about 350 per year. This amounts to about 275 per year for the four periods.

---

[1] _Die Teilnehmerlisten des Konstanzer Konzils: Ein Beitrag zur mittelalterlichen Statistik_ (Freiburg i. Br.; 1916). This study is not an analysis of the membership of Constance, but, as the title indicates, is an introduction to the sources from which such a study might be made. In the concluding chapter, pp. 68ff, however, the author has included a list of participants by ranks which he titles _wirklich in Konstanz nachweisbare Teilnehmer_. Another list titled _nur in den Listen erweisbare Namen_, is also included. This comparison is drawn from the former list.

Riegel lists 167 bishops and 34 episcopal representatives[2] and 108 abbots and 36 abbatial representatives as participants at Constance. Periods two and three at Basle show 190 bishops and 114 episcopal proctors and 132 abbots and 32 abbatial proctors. Periods three and four saw the incorporation of so few from the higher ranks that comparison is not warranted.

This shows that the Council of Constance and periods two and three of the Council of Basle are remarkably similar. It is strange that so much should have been made of the membership of the Council of Basle, both at the time and in the modern literature, since there is no model or established norm for the determination of the proper membership of a Council. This sketchy comparison of Basle with Constance shows that the former was almost as well attended as the latter for its earlier years and that it also contained as high a proportion of prelates or their proctors. Any charge of meanness as a characteristic of the membership in the early years at Basle could as well be attributed to Constance.

---

[2] Gesandte. It would be incorrect to style these as proctors which implies a legal condition of agency and which was not necessary for a representative at Constance. The strict incorporation procedures of Basle with the formal oath which was binding on the proctor's principal made the formal, documented practice of proctorship necessary.

III. THE FAILURE OF CONCILIARISM AT BASLE

Essentially, the history of the Council of Basle is the history of a struggle between the Romany Papacy and the Basilian Fathers, but having said this it is necessary to determine the issues between them and the forces they represented. There is no problem of determining the success or failure of the Council, for it most certainly failed, and with it came the failure of conciliarism; but still the nature of the failure needs a precise definition.

In understanding the Council of Basle it must be remembered that its seminal force lay in the doctrine of conciliarism which came out of the confusion and distress of the Great Schism. This doctrine gained currency only when all other prospects of solution had failed, and its moment of acceptance passed at Constance with the solution of the crisis which had created it. Still, there were those who saw in conciliarism not only a method of solving a momentary problem but also a better plan for the governance of the Church, or some other advantage. These men gained Frequens at Constance, and later they saw that its provisions were observed. The existence of periodic Councils as established by Frequens was a clear challenge to the traditional position of the Papacy, and the attempts of the Papacy to obviate their implications cannot be surprising.

The early difficulties at Basle in gaining attendance and the lessening frequency of arrivals after Eugene's recognition in 1433 indicate that the Council was not widely held as a likely instrument of positive accomplishment in its own time. The great bulk of the Basilian Fathers came when the hostility between Pope and Council was most obvious and when the presumption of conciliar superiority was most clearly maintained. This pattern leads to the conclusion that the attraction of the Council depended less on its capacity for ruling or righting the Church than its value as a base from which to humble the Papacy. It is clear from this that the Council was foredoomed as a permanent institution, for if it won in its contention with Rome it would have served its purpose to those who composed it, and they would abandon it. This is exactly what happened after its victory over the Papacy in 1433.

The renewal of hostilities in 1437 evoked again an interest in the Council, but its weakened position made it less attractive than before, and when its continuing losses forced it to assume more and more immoderate positions it became useful to fewer and fewer until it was supported only by the very special interests of select, particular states. Only France and the Empire could have sustained the conciliarism of Frequens as a continuing part of the European scene, but the reform effort of Basle, regardless of its intent, had given these two all they could digest at the time, and they had no stake in the continuation of the ideal.

The Council of Basle was a base for protest against the catholicity of the traditional medieval Church and society by the ascendant forces of particularism. At first, as the princes hung back, it was the particularism within the _ecclesia_ itself which sought an end to distant control, but the papal powers of coercion and persuasion were still sufficient to undermine this. Later it was the interests of the secular polities which were primarily trying to free themselves from an anachronistic catholicity which was embodied in and symbolized by the Papacy; but the state could hardly expect permanent emancipation if they simply wrested the control of the central authority from Rome and seated it in universal Councils. The idea of the Councils, which might have been perpetuated as an agency of secular influence in ecclesiastical matters, ran counter to the force of particularism, and the state could benefit only from the immediate use and prompt dispatch of the Council of Basle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ady, C. *Pius II, the Humanist Pope*. London, 1913.

Almanach der Akademie der Wissenchaften in Wien, 55. Jahrgang, Wien, 1918.

Anzeiger der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch- und Historische Classe, 22. Jahrgang, 29 Jahrgang, 32. Jahrgang, Wien, 1873, 1891, 1896.

Sitzungsbericht der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch- Historische Classe, IIIff., Wien, 1849-.

Allmand, C. T. "Normandy and the Council of Basel," *Speculum*, XL.

Altmann, Wilhelm. "Zur Geschichte der Erhebung des Peterspfennigs im Königreich Polen durch Beauftragte des Baseler Konzils," *Zeitschrift fur die Provinz Posen zugleich der historischen Gesellschaft fur den Netzedistrikt zu Bromberg*, 5. Jahrgang, 1890.

Altmann, W. "Die Stellung der deutschen Nation des Baseler Konzils zu der Ausschreibung eines Zehnten, durch welchen die zur Griechenunion notwendigen Geldmittel beschafft werden sollten," *Zeitschrift fur Kirchengeschichte XI, 1890*.

Ammon, Hans. *Johannes Schele, Bischof von Lübeck auf dem Basler Konzil*, in *Veröffentlichungen zur Geschichte der freien und Hansestadt Lübeck*, Bd. 10, 1931.

Bachmann, Adolph. "Die deutschen Könige und die kurfürstliche Neutralität (1438-1447)," *Archiv fur österreichische Geschichte*, 75, 1889.

"Jahresbericht der historische- und antiquarischen Gesellschaft zu Basle," 1928, *Basler Zeitschrift fur Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, XXVII.

Becker, P. *Giuliano Cesarini*. Kallmünz, 1935.

Beer, Rudolph. "Urkundliche Beiträge zu Johannes de Segovias Geschichte des Basler Konzils," *Sitzungsbericht der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-Historische Classe*, CXXXV (1897).

Birk, M. "Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini als Geschichtsschreiber des Basler Konzils," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, LXXVI (1894).

Bliemetzrieder, Franz. *Das Generalkonzil im grossen abendländischen Schisma*. Paderborn, 1904.

Boulting, W. *Aeneas Silvius, Orator, Man of Letters, Statesman, and Pope*. London, 1908.

Bressler, H. *Die Stellung der deutschen Universitäten zum Basler Konzil, zum Schisma, und zu der deutschen Neutralität*. Leipzig, 1885.

Bruchet, M. *Le château de Ripaille*. Paris, 1907.

Burns, J. H. *Scottish Churchmen and the Council of Basle*. Glasgow, 1962.

Bursche, Edmund. *Die Reformarbeiten des Basler Konzils*. Lodz, 1921.

Cambridge Medieval History, VII, *The Close of the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, 1936.

Cecconi, E. *Studi storici sul concilio de Firenze*. Florence, 1869.

Cohn, W. "Die Basler Konzilsflotte des Jahres 1437," *Basler Zeitschrift fur Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, Bd. 12, 1913.

Concilium Basiliense. Johannes Haller, *et*. *al*. (eds.), I-VIII, Basle, 1896-1935.

Creighton, Mandell. *A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome*. Vols I-III. London, 1882-1897.

Dax, L. *Die Universitäten und die Konzilien von Pisa und Konstanz*. Freiburg i. Br., 1910.

Deutsche Reichstagakten, hrsg. durch die historische Kommission bei der kgl. Akademie der Wissenschaften. 13 vols. Munich, 1867ff.

Diener, Hermann. "Zur Persönlichkeit des Johannes de Segovia: Ein Beitrag zur Methode der Auswertung päpstlicher Register des späten Mittelalters," *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven*, XLVI.

Dombrovski, Ludwig. *Die Beziehungen des Deutschen Ordens zum Basler Konzil*. Berlin, 1913.

Du Cange, C. D. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*. 10 vols. Paris, 1678.

Eckstein, Alexander. *Zur Finanzlage des Basler Konzils*. Berlin, 1911.

Eckstein, Alexander. *Zur Finanzlage Felix V. und des Basler Konzils*. Berlin, 1912 (Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche, XI-XIV, Berlin, 1912).

Ehses, Stefan. "Der Reformentwurf des Kardinals Nikolaus Cusanus," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XIII.

Eubel, Conrad. *Hierarchia Catholica*. Vol. II. Munster, 1914.

Fea, Carolus. *Pius II, Pontifex Maximus, a calumniis vindicatus*. Rome, 1824.

Fechner, H. *Giuliano Cesarini bis zu seiner Ankunft in Basel*. Berlin, 1907.

Fechter, E. "Basel im Kriege gegen die Armagnaken," *Basler Taschenbuch*, 1862.

Figgis, J. N. *Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius: 1415-1625*. New York, 1960 (reprint).

Frommherz, Uta. *Johannes von Segovia als Geschichtsschreiber des Konzils von Basel* (Basler Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 81). Basel, 1960.

Gams, P. Pius Bonifatius, *Series Episcoporum*. Ratispon, 1873.

Gill, Joseph. *The Council of Florence*. Cambridge, 1959.

———. *Eugenius IV* (*The Popes Through History*, No. 1). New York, 1963.

Gill, Joseph. *Personalities of the Council of Florence, and Other Essays*. New York, 1964.

Gottschalk, A. *Kaiser Sigmund als Vermittler zwischen Papst und Konzil (1431-1434)*. Erlangen, 1911.

Haller, Johannes. "Beiträge zur Geschichte des Konzils von Basel," *Zeitschrift fur die Geschichte des Oberrheins*," XVI (1901).

Haller, Johannes. *Concilium Basiliense*, *q. v.*

_______. "Die Kirchenreform auf dem Konzil zu Basel," *Korrespondenzblatt des Gesamtvereins der deutschen Geschichts- und Altertumsvereine*, 1910.

_______. *Papsttum und Kirchenreform*. Berlin, 1903.

_______. "Die Protokolle des Konzils von Basel," *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXIV (1895).

_______. "Unionsverhandlungen und Konflikt mit der Kurie," *Concilium Basiliense*, I. Basle, 1896.

Hanna, Conrad. *Die sudwestdeutschen Diözesen und das Basler Konzil in den Jahren 1431-1441*. Borna-Leipzig, 1929.

Hauck, Albert. "Die Rezeption und Umbildung der allgemeinen Synode im Mittelalter," *Historisches Vierteljahrschrift*, X.

Hefele, C. V. and H. Leclercq. *Histoire des Conciles*. Vol. VII. Paris, 1916.

Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours, XIV: L'Eglise au temps du Grand Schisme et de la Crise Conciliaire (1378-1449). E. Dalaruelle, E.-R. Labande, and Paul Ourliac. Paris, 1962.

Jacob, E. F. "The Bohemians at the Council of Basle," *Prague Essays*. Seton-Watson, R. W. (ed.). Oxford, 1949.

Jedin, Hubert. "Bischöfliches Konzil oder Kirchenparlament: Ein Beitrag zur Ekklesiologie der Konzilien von Konstanz und Basel," *Vorträge der Aeneas Silvius Stiftung an der Universität Basel*. Basel, 1963.

_______. *Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church*: *An Historical Outline*. New York, 1961.

Jenkins, Robert. *The Last Crusader*: *or the Life and Times of Cardinal Julian of the House of Cesarini*. London, 1861.

John of Ragusa. *Initium et prosecutio concilii basiliensis*, in *Monumenta Conciliorum* (*q. v.*), I.

_______. *Tractatus de reductione Bohemorum*, in *Monumenta Conciliorum* (*q. v.*), I.

John of Segovia. *Historia gestorum synodi basiliensis*, in *Monumenta Conciliorum* (*q. v.*), II, III.

Kaminsky, Howard, Dean Loy Bilderback, Imre Boba, and Patricia N. Rosenberg. "Master Nicholas of Dresden, *The Old Color and the New*: Selected Works Contrasting the *Primitive Church* and the Roman Church," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series, LV, pt. 1, Philadelphia, 1965.

Kaminsky, H. "Wyclifism as Ideology of Revolution," *Church History*, XXXII.

Lazarus, Paul. *Das Basler Konzil*: *seine Berufung und Leitung*, *seine Gliederung und seine Behördenorganisation*. Berlin, 1912.

Lecoyde la March, A. "Amèdée VIII et son sejour a Ripaille," *Revue des Questions Historiques*, I, 1868.

Lenfant, J. *Histoire de la guerre des Hussites et du concile de Bâle*. Amsterdam, 1731.

Lobineau, D. *Histoire de Bretagne*. 2 vols. Paris, 1707.

Manger, H. *Die Wahl Amadäus' von Savoyen zum Päpste durch das Basler Konzil*. Marburg, 1901.

Mansi, Gian Dominico. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, XXVII-XXXI, Venice, 1784-1798.

Martin, Victor. "Comment s'Est Formée la Doctrine de la Superiorité du Concile sur le Pape," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, XVII.

Merkle, S. "Konzilsprotokolle oder Konzilstagebücher? Erörterungen zu den Geschichtaquellen des basler und trienter Konzils," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XXV (1904).

Mollat, G. *Les Papes d'Avignon* (*1305-1378*). Paris, 1912.

Monumenta conciliorum seculi decimi quinti. F. Palacký, E. Birk, *et*. *al*.(eds.). Vienna and Basle, 1857-1935.

Mühll, Theodora v. d. *Vorspiel zur Zeitenwende*. Munich, 1959.

Niermeyer, J. F. *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minor*. Leiden, 1954.

Ourliac, see *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*.

Ourliac, Paul. "Sociologie du Concile de Bâle," *Revue d' histoire ecclésiastique*, LVI, 1.

Palacký, František. *Documenta M. Joannis Hus*. Prague, 1869.

______. *Geschichte von Böhmen*, III. Prague, 1845-1854.

Pastor, Ludwig. *Geschichte des Päpste*, I. Leipzig, 1884.

Perouse, Gabriel. *Le Cardinal Louis Aleman, président du concile de Bâle et la fin du Grand Schisme*. Paris, 1904.

Pfister, Christian. "Über Kardinal d'Aleman," *Revue historique*, Paris, LXXXVII.

Picolomini, Aeneas Sylvius, see Wolkan and Fea.

Preiswerk, Eduard. *Der Einfluss Aragons auf den Prozess des Basler Konzils gegen Papst Eugen IV*. Basel, 1902.

Puckert, W. *Die Kurfürstliche Neutralität während des Basler Konzils*. Leipzig, 1859.

Quentin, R. P. Henri. *Jean-Dominique Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires*. Paris, 1900.

Redlich, Virgil. "Eine Universität auf dem Konzil zu Basel," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 49, 1949.

Richter, Otto. *Die Organisation und Geschäftsordnung des Basler Konzils*. Leipzig, 1877.

Riegel, Josef. *Die Teilnehmerlisten des Konstanzer Konzils. Ein Beitrag zur mittelalterlichen Statistik*. Freiburg i. Br., 1916.

Roth, Paul. *Das Basler Konzil*, 1431-1448. Bern, 1931.

Schneider, F. *Der europäische Friedenskongress von Arras (1435) und die Friedenspolitik Papst Eugen IV und des Basler Konzils*. Greiz, 1919.

Schofield, A. N. E. D. "England, the Pope, and the Council of Basel, 1435-1449," *Reunion*, VI.

______. "The First English Delegation to the Council of Basel," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XII.

Scholz, R. *Die Publizistik zur Zeit Philipps des Schönen und Bonifaz VIII*. Stuttgart, 1903.

Schwiezer, Julius. *Nikolas de' Tudeschi: seine Tätigkeit am* Basler Konzil. Basel, 1924.

Seton-Watson, R. W. *Prague Essays*, see Jacob, E. F.

Siebeking, M. *Organisation und Geschäftsordnung des Kostnitzer Konzils*. Leipzig, 1872.

Stuhr, Friedrich. *Die Organisation und Geschäftsordnung des Pisaner und Konstanzer Konzils*. Berlin, 1891.

Stutt, H. *Die nordwestdeutschen Diözesen und das Basler Konzil in den Jahren 1431 bis 1441*. Erlangen, 1928.

Stutz, Josef. *Felix V. und die Schweiz*. Fribourg, 1930.

Thommen, Rudolph. "Basel und das Basler Konzil," *Basler Jahrbuch*, 1895.

Tierney, Brian. *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory. The Contributions of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism*. Cambridge, 1955.

Toussaint, Joseph. "Les Rélations Diplomatiques de Philippe le Bon avec le Concile de Bâle (1431-1449)," *Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie,* 3me serie, 9e fascicule, Louvain, 1942.

Valois, Noel. *La crise religieuse du XVe siècle. Le Pape et le concile (1418-1450)*. 2 vols. Paris, 1909.

_______. *Histoire de la Pragmatique Sanction de Bourges sous Charles VII*. Paris, 1906.

Vaucelle, E. "La Bretagne et le concile de Bâle," *Annales de Saint-Louis-des-Français*, Xe année, 1905.

Voigt, Georg. *Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini als Papst Pius II. und sein Zeitalter*. 3 vols. Berlin, 1856, 1862, 1863.

Wackernagel, R. *Geschichte der Stadt Basel*, II. Basel, 1911.

Weber, Gertrud. *Die selbständige Vermittlungspolitik der Kurfürsten im Konflikt zwischen Papst und Konzil, 1437-1438*. Berlin, 1915.

Weiss, A. *Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini als Papst Pius II*. Graz, 1897.

Wittram, R. *Die französische Politik auf dem Basler Konzil während der Zeit seiner Blüte*. Riga, 1927.

Wolkan, R. *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini (1431-1454)*, *Fontes rerum austriacarum*, II^{e} serie, tomes, LXI, LXII, LXVII, et LXVIII. Vienna, 1909-1918.

Zegarski, Teofil. *Polen und das Basler Konzil*. Posen, 1910.

Zeibig, H-J. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Wirksamkeit des basler Concils in Österreichs," *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch- Historische Classe*, VIII, 1852.

Zellfelder, A. *Die Beziehungen Englands zum Basler Konzil bis zum Friedenskongress von Arras*. Erlangen, 1911.

_______. *England und das Basler Konzil*. Berlin, 1913.

Zimmermann, A. *Juan de Segovia*. Breslau, 1882.

Zlocisti, M. *Die Gesandtschaft des Basler Konzils nach Avignon und Konstantinopel*. Halle, 1908.

Zwölfer, R. "Die Reform der Kirchenverfassung auf dem Konzil von Basel," *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, XXVII, XXIX.

APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION TO APPENDICES

The data upon which this study is based are presented in the following three appendices. Appendix I (page 193) contains data relative to the geographical origins of the Fathers. Appendix II (page 216) presents the data from which the conclusions concerning the ranks and offices of the Fathers are drawn. Appendix III (page 242) is a register of the persons, personal proctors, and corporate proctors who were incorporated into the Council.

The data in Appendices I and II are presented according to the geographical unit from which the individual members of the Council came and the period of the Council during which they arrived. The geopraphical unit generally used is the archiepiscopal province. The reason for the selection of this unit for the study is explained on page in the Introduction to Appendix I, as are the reasons for the occasional departures from its use. The chronological units used in the following presentations are explained in the appropriate chapters and are as follows:

Period I	February, 1431 - February, 1432
Period II	March, 1432 - January, 1434
Period III	February, 1434 - September, 1437
Period IV	October, 1437 - June, 1439
Period V	July, 1439 - July, 1440
Period VI	August, 1440 - August, 1443

All statistical comparisons, the calculation of percentages, and the presentation of Relative Proportion Indices have been prepared on the basis of the appropriate figures for Periods

II, III, IV, and V. Periods I and VI, as explained above, are epilogue and prologue to the Council. Data concerning Periods I and VI are included in the charts only when a specific reference in the text makes it necessary or desirable. The term "Council" used here embraces the time from March, 1432, through July, 1440, inclusive.

APPENDIX I

THE GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGINS OF THE FATHERS OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE

INTRODUCTION

I. DELINEATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL UNITS

The numbers of Fathers incorporated into the Council have been divided into 54 geographical units, 35 of which are presented in the charts. Those presented are those which, in total or in one of the periods of the Council, have attributed to them at least 1% of the total arrivals. Generally, the geographical divisions correspond to archiepiscopal provinces of the fifteenth century. The vastness of the See of Mainz necessitated its division into two parts, with Fathers from dioceses touching on or north of the Main River attributed to Mainz, North, and those from dioceses to the south attributed to Mainz, South. Three of the areas presented represent a combination of provinces. "Ireland" denotes all four of the Hibernian provinces, Tuam, Armagh, Cashel, and Dublin; "Italy" includes all the provinces south of the provinces of Ravenna and Genoa, including Sicily; and "Scotland" includes the provinces of St. Andrew and Glasgow. The areas are presented in the rank order of the size of the delegations, from largest to smallest in terms of the total number of Fathers attending the Council from February, 1432, through July, 1440.

The archiepiscopal province has been taken as the basic geographic unit for this study, not because it is a particularly meaningful unit of political, social, or even ecclesiastical action in the fifteenth century, but because it has reasonably constant boundaries and is usually sufficiently sizeable that definite tendencies are recognizable within it. It is also useful because the boundaries of a province or group of provinces are usually congruent with the general boundaries of the major European political units. The glaring exception to this rule is in the case of the Savoyard Lands. It was necessary to divide the provinces of Milan and Besançon into their Savoyard and non-Savoyard parts. In the charts the provinces are presented without violation of their integrity and with the figures for the two parts given immediately below the main entry.

II. METHOD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE FIGURES TAKEN FROM JOHN OF SEGOVIA'S HISTORIA GENERALIS

The data for the years 1432 through 1436 and 1439 through 1441 are taken from the notarial records. The data for 1437-1438 as well as the data for 1442-1443, are taken from John of Segovia's Historia. For the periods during which we can depend upon the minutes, a total of 2,069 Fathers were incorporated of whom we can assign 1,528, or 73.9% of the total, to a definite point of origin, while the figures from John's Historia reveal 519 incorporated of whom we can assign only 134, or 25.8%, to a definite geographical place. The reasons for the greater accuracy of the notarial records is because of John's custom of listing the Fathers of greater distinctions fully, as they were in the minutes, giving only a brief reference to others, and simply giving the figures of the remainder. For example:

> Januario mense anno domini 1437 incorporati exitere sancte synodo Basiliensi Fridericus de Reno et Bernhardus de Roczenhusen, coelecti Basilienses, Nicolaus abbas de Sellis Bituricensis diocesis, Johannes Dubet in legibus licenciatus, frater Johannes Lerpach prepositus canonicorum regularium in Werthen Constanciensis, Canonici tres, prior unus et alii tres.[1]

John's curious habit of omitting the place of origin of some and listing the priors and canons by number cannot be explained and is unfortunate, since the point of origin of many of those must have been given in the minutes, where this information for the priors and canons is almost always given. Comparison of the incorporation records in the minutes with John's abstracts for the years 1436 and 1439, years in which the two records overlap, shows that John is virtually unerring, in his way, in the abstraction of the original; and we must assume that the records for the years 1437-1438 are equally dependable. The problem which John's idiosyncracy provides for us is the improvisation of some method by which we may adjust the figures from the Historia so they are comparable to our figures from the Protocols.

The method used for this adjustment is simple. The period for which adjustment is needed is the years 1437-

---

[1] John of Segovia, X, xxvii; M.C., II, 926.

1438. (The incorporations for the years 1442-1443 are so few as to be inconsequential.) An examination of the years 1436 and 1439 indicates no variance in the geographical patterns presented by the various ranks, so we can assume no variance for the years in question. From this assumption it is necessary only to extrapolate the patterns presented by the data from John of Segovia by a factor which will bring the total figures of known origin up to 73.9% of the total numbers of individuals mentioned. Under ordinary circumstances this could be done by multiplying the figures from John of Segovia for each geographical area by 2.86. This cannot be done, however, because our dependence upon John spans two of our chronological periods, the third and fourth. The reason for the periodization is to distinguish variations between periods when different interests dominated the Council and to correct the whole span during which we are dependent upon John as one unit. Despite the fact that this cuts across two periods, to handle the problem by another method would be to encourage artificial similarities. Hence, we must extrapolate the figures for the periods from January through September, 1437, and October, 1437, through December, 1438, separately on the basis of the patterns suggested by each. In the first period, January through September, 1437, a total of 159 persons are recorded as having been incorporated; and of these, a specific point of origin is given for 49, or 30.8% of the total. To extrapolate this figure to the point at which it is equivalent to the 73.9% found in the notarial minutes, it is necessary to multiply the number of Fathers in each geographical area by 2.39 (2.39 x 30.8 = 73.9). To clarify this procedure, note Mainz, South, in Chart II, Period III. A total of five persons are listed by John as coming from this area (Column D). In order to extrapolate this figure it is necessary to multiply it by 2.39, thus arriving at the adjusted figure for Mainz, South, which is 12 (2.39 x 5 = 12), or 7 must be added to the original 5 (Column E).

For the months of October, 1437, through December, 1438, we find that 399 persons were incorporated of whom we can assign 88, or 22%, to some definite area. In order to extrapolate this figure to the 73.9% level it is necessary to multiply the figures for each area by 3.35 (3.35 x 22.0 = 73.9). Again, refer to Mainz, South, this time in Period IV. Again, John listed five Fathers from this area as having been incorporated (Column D). In this instance, however, we multiply 5 by 3.35, which gives us 17 for the delegation from Mainz, South, or an addition lf 12 (Column E).

III. PRESENTATION OF DATA

The collected data on the geographical origins of the Fathers are presented in the following charts, the first of which presents the data for periods II through V of the Council. Within this chart Column X presents the total number of Fathers mentioned in the sources for each area. Column Y presents the total number of Fathers arriving from each area, including the adjustment for the omissions of John of Segovia. Column Z presents the percentage of the total number of Fathers from each area.

Chart II presents the data for the four periods of the Council. There are a number of columns presenting the data for each period.

Column A presents the total number of arrivals for which the place of origin is known from the sources.

Column B presents the total number of arrivals adjusted to account for the omissions of John of Segovia. This column appears only for the appropriate periods.

Column C gives the percentage of the total arrivals for each period from each geographical area.

Column D gives the total number of delegates from each particular geographical area taken from John of Segovia. This column appears only for the appropriate periods.

Column E presents the number added to Column A to adjust for the omissions of John of Segovia. This column appears only for the appropriate periods.

Column F presents the percentage of the total delegations arriving from February, 1432, through August, 1440, from each particular geographical area in each particular chronological period.

Column G presents the relative proportion index for each area in each period. This figure expresses the relative proportion of Fathers drawn to the Council in each period, and it is derived by dividing the percentage of the total delegation arriving from a given area in a given period (the percentage figure in Column F) by the percentage of the time of the Council covered by the particular period. For example, in Chart II, Period II, we see that 44 Fathers arrived from Mainz, South, during Period I, which represented 28.9% of the total number of Fathers incorporated from Mainz, South, in the course of the Council. Period II represents the period from March, 1432, through January, 1434, or 22.77% of the time of the Council proper. When we divide the percentage of the total number of Fathers, 28.9%, by the percentage of the total amount of time represented by the Period, 22.77%, we get an index number of 1.27. This means that for each unit of time 1.27 units of Fathers were incorporated into the Council. Hence, we know that the ecclesiastics in the area of Mainz, South, were attracted to the Council in this period at a slightly greater rate than they were in the time of the Council generally.

Column H presents an adjusted relative proportion index. The adjustment is necessitated by the fact that Latin Christendom as a whole did not feel the same attraction to come to the Council in all periods. In the second period 462 Fathers arrived, in the third 606 (adjusted figure), in the fourth 345 (adjusted figure), and in the fifth, the last period of the Council proper, 365, for a total of 1,778. This means that 25.9%, 33.5%, 19.3%, and 20.5% of the total for the Council proper arrived in the second, third, fourth, and fifth periods of the Council respectively. Dividing the percentages of arrivals for each period by the percentage of the total time span of the Council proper covered in each period, we find that the four periods have, in order, indices of 1.13, .76, .92, and 1.59. In order to distinguish the geographical areas which showed marked interest or disinterest in a given period, it is necessary to adjust the relative proportion index by the factor of the relative proportion of the particular period; that is, it is necessary to divide the index figure in Column G by the index for the period in question. For example, the relative proportion index for Mainz, South, in the second period of the Council is 1.37; but, since Christendom as a whole reacted to this period by sending a slightly larger than average proportion of Fathers, namely .13 larger, it is necessary to divide 1.37 by 1.13 in order to establish the relationship of the Mainz, South, delegation to other delegations. We find that the Mainz, South, delegation was .21 larger proportionately than the size which the time span would have suggested.

Finally, the most important figures from the preceding charts have been gathered in Chart III for the various political or ethnic units of Europe which are most important to the understanding of this study. These areas are Aragon, Castile-Leon, France, Brittany, Savoy, and Germany. The precise composition of these areas is shown in the charts. For purposes of verifying or criticizing the conclusions of this study it will probably be most convenient to use Chart III.

CHART I

MARCH, 1432 - AUGUST, 1440

		X	Y	Z
1.	Mainz, S.	122	141	7.9%
2.	Cologne	102	115	6.4
3.	Milan	91	114	6.4
	Savoyard Lands	32	34	1.9
	Non-Savoyard Lands	59	80	4.5
4.	Tours	105	113	6.3
5.	Besançon	75	86	4.8
	Savoyard Lands	20	20	1.1
	Non-Savoyard Lands	55	66	3.6
6.	Mainz, N.	73	81	4.5
7.	Salzburg	63	79	4.4
8-9.	Treves	58	78	4.3
8-9.	Reims	73	78	4.3
10.	Lyons	60	67	3.7
11-12.	Tarragona	37	65	3.6
11-12.	Bourges	55	65	3.6
13.	Narbonne	50	63	3.5
14.	Rouen	49	56	3.1
15.	Sens	39	51	2.8
16.	Vienne	46	49	2.7
17-18.	Toledo	34	37	2.0
17-18.	Genoa	27	37	2.0
19.	Aquileia	34	36	2.0
20.	Ravenna	23	28	1.5
21-23.	Magdeburg	23	26	1.4
21-23.	Arles	26	26	1.4
21-23.	Scotland	26	26	1.4
24.	Bourdeaux	25	25	1.4
25.	Saragossa	13	21	1.1
26.	Italy	18	18	1.0
27-28.	Tarentaise	17	17	.9
27-28.	Riga	16	17	.9
29-31.	Gnesen	16	16	.8
29-31.	Santiago	16	16	.8
29-31.	Embrun	16	16	.8
32.	Dalmatia	14	14	.7
33-34.	Gran	11	11	.6
33-34.	Venice	11	11	.6
35-36.	Valencia	9	9	.5
35-36.	Pomerania	8	9	.5
37.	Ireland	8	8	.4

CHART II

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF INCORPORATIONS BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS, PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL DELEGATIONS, AND PROPORTION INDICES FOR PERIODS II, III, IV, AND V

PERIOD II: MARCH, 1432-JANUARY, 1434		A	C	F	G	H
1.	Mainz, S.	44	9.5%	31.2%	1.37	1.21
2.	Cologne	31	6.7	26.9	1.18	1.04
3.	Milan	36	7.7	31.5	1.38	1.22
	Savoyard Lands	2	.4	5.8	.25	.22
	Non-Savoyard Lands	34	7.3	42.5	1.86	1.64
4.	Tours	15	3.2	13.2	.57	.50
5.	Besançon	16	3.4	18.6	.81	.71
	Savoyard Lands	5	1.0	25.0	1.09	.96
	Non-Savoyard Lands	11	2.4	16.6	.72	.63
6.	Mainz, N.	20	4.3	24.6	1.08	.95
7.	Salzburg	23	4.9	29.1	1.27	1.12
8-9.	Treves	16	3.4	20.5	.90	.79
8-9.	Reims	31	6.7	39.7	1.74	1.53
10.	Lyons	20	4.3	29.8	1.30	1.15
11-12.	Bourges	16	3.4	29.0	1.27	1.12
11-12.	Tarragona	--	---	----	----	----
13.	Narbonne	10	2.1	15.8	.69	.61
14.	Rouen	19	4.1	33.9	1.48	1.30
15.	Sens	13	2.8	25.4	1.11	.98
16.	Vienne	15	3.2	30.6	1.34	1.18
17-18.	Toledo	11	2.3	29.7	1.30	1.15
17-18.	Genoa	17	3.6	45.9	2.01	1.77
19.	Aquileia	7	1.5	19.5	.85	.75
20.	Ravenna	16	3.4	57.1	2.50	2.21

CHART II (continued)

PERIOD II: MARCH, 1432-JANUARY, 1434		A	C	F	G	H
21-23.	Magdeburg	9	1.9%	34.6%	1.51	1.33
21-23.	Arles	11	2.3	42.3	1.85	1.63
21-23.	Scotland	1	.2	3.8	.16	.14
24.	Bourdeaux	9	1.9	36.0	1.58	1.39
25.	Saragossa	--	---	----	----	----
26.	Italy	2	.4	11.1	.48	.37
27-28.	Tarentaise	2	.4	11.7	.51	.45
27-28.	Riga	5	1.0	29.4	1.29	1.14
29-31.	Gnesen	5	1.0	31.2	1.37	1.21
29-31.	Santiago	3	.6	18.7	.82	.72
29-31.	Embrun	4	.8	25.0	1.09	.96
32.	Dalmatia	4	.8	28.5	1.25	1.10
33-34.	Gran	7	1.5	63.6	2.79	2.46
33-34.	Venice	2	.4	18.1	.79	.69
35-36.	Valencia	--	---	----	----	----
35-36.	Pomerania	2	.4	22.2	.97	.85
37.	Ireland	5	1.0	62.5	2.74	2.42

PERIOD III: FEBRUARY, 1434-SEPTEMBER, 1437		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1.	Mainz, S.	40	47	7.7%	5	7	33.3%	.76	.97
2.	Cologne	36	42	6.9	4	6	36.5	.83	1.06
3.	Milan	19	29	4.7	7	10	25.4	.58	.74
	Savoyard Lands	3	3	.4	0	0	8.8	.20	.25
	Non-Savoyard Lands	16	26	4.3	7	10	32.5	.74	.94
4.	Tours	27	28	4.6	1	1	24.7	.56	71

CHART II (continued)

PERIOD III: FEBRUARY, 1434-SEPTEMBER, 1437		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
5.	Besançon	14	18	2.9%	3	4	20.9%	.47	.60
	Savoyard Lands	3	3	.4	0	0	15.0	.34	.43
	Non-Savoyard Lands	11	15	2.5	3	4	22.7	.52	.66
6.	Mainz, N.	30	31	5.1	1	1	38.2	.87	1.11
7.	Salzburg	18	18	2.9	0	0	22.7	.52	.66
8-9.	Treves	19	23	3.7	3	4	29.4	.67	.85
8-9.	Reims	34	37	6.1	2	3	47.4	1.08	1.38
10.	Lyons	13	13	2.1	0	0	19.4	.44	.56
11-12.	Tarragona	8	15	2.4	5	7	22.0	.51	.66
11-12.	Bourges	28	29	4.7	1	1	44.6	1.02	1.30
13.	Narbonne	20	26	4.3	4	6	41.2	.94	1.23
14.	Rouen	16	16	2.6	0	0	28.5	.65	.83
15.	Sens	16	16	2.6	0	0	31.3	.71	.91
16.	Vienne	7	8	1.3	1	1	16.3	.37	.47
17-18.	Genoa	7	10	1.6	2	3	27.0	.61	.78
17-18.	Toledo	19	20	3.3	1	1	54.0	1.23	1.57
19.	Aquileia	20	20	3.3	0	0	55.5	1.27	1.62
20.	Ravenna	5	5	.8	0	0	17.8	.40	.51
21-23.	Magdeburg	10	11	1.8	1	1	42.3	.97	1.24
21-23.	Arles	11	11	1.8	0	0	42.3	.97	1.24
21-23.	Scotland	23	23	3.7	0	0	88.4	2.02	2.58
24.	Bourdeaux	9	9	1.4	0	0	36.0	.82	1.05
25.	Saragossa	4	7	1.1	2	3	33.3	.76	.97
26.	Italy	12	12	1.9	0	0	66.6	1.52	1.94
27-28.	Tarentaise	1	1	.1	0	0	5.8	.13	.11
27-28.	Riga	7	8	1.3	1	1	47.0	1.07	1.37
29-31.	Gnesen	6	6	.9	0	0	37.5	.86	1.10

CHART II (continued)

PERIOD III: FEBRUARY, 1434-SEPTEMBER, 1437		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
29-31.	Santiago	13	13	2.1%	0	0	81.2%	1.86	2.38
29-31.	Embrun	6	6	.9	0	0	37.5	.86	1.10
32.	Dalmatia	10	10	1.6	0	0	71.4	1.63	2.08
33-34.	Gran	2	2	.3	0	0	18.1	.41	.16
33-34.	Venice	9	9	1.4	0	0	81.8	1.87	2.39
35-36.	Valencia	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----
35-36.	Pomerania	2	3	.4	1	1	33.3	.76	.97
37.	Ireland	3	3	.4	0	0	37.5	.86	1.10
PERIOD IV: OCTOBER, 1437 - JUNE, 1439									
1.	Mainz, S.	12	24	6.9%	5	12	17.0%	.81	.87
2.	Cologne	31	38	11.0	3	7	33.3	1.58	1.69
3.	Milan	11	23	6.6	5	12	20.1	.96	1.03
	Savoyard Lands	3	5	1.1	1	2	14.7	.70	.75
	Non-Savoyard Lands	8	18	5.5	4	10	22.5	.98	1.05
4.	Tours	6	13	3.7	3	7	11.5	.55	.59
5.	Besançon	13	20	5.7	3	7	23.2	1.11	1.19
	Savoyard Lands	2	2	.5	0	0	10.0	.43	.46
	Non-Savoyard Lands	11	18	5.2	3	7	27.2	1.19	1.27
6.	Mainz, N.	8	15	4.3	3	7	18.5	.88	.94
7.	Salzburg	11	27	7.8	7	16	34.1	1.64	1.76
8-9.	Treves	10	26	7.5	7	16	33.3	1.60	1.72
8-9.	Reims	4	6	1.7	1	2	7.6	.36	.38
10.	Lyons	7	14	4.0	3	7	20.8	1.00	1.07

CHART II (continued)

PERIOD IV: OCTOBER, 1437 - JUNE, 1439	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
11-12. Tarragona	17	38	11.0%	9	21	58.4%	2.80	3.01
11-12. Bourges	5	14	4.0	4	9	21.5	1.03	1.10
13. Narbonne	10	17	4.9	3	7	26.9	1.29	1.38
14. Rouen	6	13	3.7	3	7	23.2	1.11	1.19
15. Sens	5	16	4.6	5	12	31.3	1.50	1.61
16. Vienne	3	5	1.4	1	2	10.2	.49	.52
17-18. Toledo	1	3	.8	1	2	8.1	.38	.40
17-18. Genoa	3	10	2.8	3	7	27.0	1.29	1.38
19. Aquileia	1	3	.8	1	2	8.3	.39	.41
20. Ravenna	2	7	2.0	2	5	25.0	1.20	1.29
21-23. Magdeburg	1	3	.8	1	2	11.5	.55	.59
21-23. Arles	2	2	.5	0	0	7.6	.36	.38
21-23. Scotland	1	1	.2	0	0	3.8	.18	.19
24. Bourdeaux	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----
25. Saragossa	3	8	2.3	2	5	38.0	1.82	1.95
26. Italy	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----
27-28. Tarentaise	2	2	.5	0	0	11.7	.56	.60
27-28. Riga	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----
29-31. Gnesen	1	1	.2	0	0	6.2	.29	.31
29-31. Santiago	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----
29-31. Embrun	2	2	.5	0	0	12.5	.60	.64
32. Dalmatia	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----
33-34. Gran	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----
33-34. Venice	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----
35-36. Valencia	5	5	1.4	0	0	55.5	2.66	2.86
35-36. Pomerania	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----
37. Ireland	--	--	---	-	-	----	----	----

CHART II (continued)

PERIOD V: AUGUST, 1439-AUGUST, 1440		A	C	F	G	H
1.	Mainz, S.	26	7.1%	18.4%	1.42	.87
2.	Cologne	28	7.6	24.3	1.88	1.18
3.	Milan	25	6.8	21.9	1.70	1.06
	Savoyard Lands	24	6.5	70.5	5.47	3.44
	Non-Savoyard Lands	1	.3	----	----	----
4.	Tours	57	15.6	50.4	3.91	2.45
5.	Besançon	32	8.7	37.2	2.89	1.81
	Savoyard Lands	10	2.7	50.0	3.88	2.44
	Non-Savoyard Lands	22	6.0	33.3	2.58	1.62
6.	Mainz, N.	15	4.1	18.5	1.43	.89
7.	Salzburg	11	3.0	13.9	1.08	.67
8-9.	Treves	13	3.5	16.6	1.28	.80
8-9.	Reims	4	1.0	5.1	.39	.24
10.	Lyons	20	5.4	29.8	2.31	1.45
11-12.	Tarragona	12	3.2	18.4	1.42	.87
11-12.	Bourges	6	1.6	9.2	.71	.44
13.	Narbonne	10	2.7	15.8	1.22	.76
14.	Rouen	8	2.1	14.2	1.10	.69
15.	Sens	5	1.3	9.8	.76	.47
16.	Vienne	21	5.7	42.8	3.32	2.08
17-18.	Toledo	3	.8	8.1	.62	.38
17-18.	Genoa	--	----	----	----	----
19.	Aquileia	6	1.6	16.6	1.28	.80
20.	Ravenna	--	----	----	----	----
21-23.	Magdeburg	3	.8	11.5	.89	.55
21-23.	Arles	2	.5	7.6	.59	.37
21-23.	Scotland	1	.2	3.8	.29	.18
24.	Bourdeaux	7	1.9	28.0	2.17	1.36

CHART II (continued)

PERIOD V: AUGUST, 1439-AUGUST, 1440		A	C	F	G	H
25.	Saragossa	6	1.6%	28.5%	2.21	1.38
26.	Italy	4	1.0	22.2	1.72	1.08
27-28.	Tarentaise	12	3.2	70.5	5.47	3.44
27-28.	Riga	4	1.0	23.5	1.82	1.14
29-31.	Gnesen	4	1.0	25.0	1.94	1.22
29-31.	Santiago	--	----	----	----	----
29-31.	Embrun	4	1.0	25.0	1.94	1.22
32.	Dalmatia	--	----	----	----	----
33-34.	Gran	2	.5	18.1	1.40	.88
33-34.	Venice	--	----	----	----	----
35-36.	Valencia	4	1.0	44.4	3.44	2.16
35-36.	Pomerania	4	1.0	44.4	3.44	2.16
37.	Ireland	--	----	----	----	----

CHART III

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF INCORPORATIONS AND PROPORTION INDICES FOR SELECTED POLITICAL OR ETHNIC AREAS FOR PERIODS II III, IV, AND V

PERIOD II: MARCH, 1432-JANUARY, 1434	C	A	H
Aragon			
Saragossa	---	---	----
Tarragona	---	---	----
Valencia	---	---	----
Castile-Leon			
Santiago	.6%	3	.72
Toledo	2.3	11	1.15
	2.9%	14	1.01
France			
Treves	3.4	16	.79
Reims	6.7	31	1.53
Lyons	4.3	20	1.15
Bourges	3.4	16	1.12
Narbonne	2.1	10	.61
Rouen	4.1	19	1.30
Sens	2.8	13	.98
Arles	2.3	11	1.63
Bourdeaux	1.9	9	1.39
	31.0	145	1.10
Brittany			
Tours	3.2	15	.50
Savoy			
Milan (pt.)	.4	2	.22
Besançon (pt.)	1.0	5	.96
Vienne	3.2	15	1.18
Tarentaise	.4	2	.45
Embrun	.8	4	.96
	5.8	28	.69

CHART III (continued)

PERIOD II: MARCH, 1432-JANUARY, 1434	C	A	H
Germany			
Mainz, S.	9.5	44	1.21
Cologne	6.7	31	1.04
Mainz, N.	4.3	20	.95
Salzburg	4.9	23	1.12
Magdeburg	1.9	9	1.33
	27.3	127	1.05

PERIOD III: FEBRUARY, 1434-SEPTEMBER, 1437	C	B	H
Aragon			
Saragossa	1.1%	7	.97
Tarragona	2.4	15	.66
Valencia	---	--	---
	3.5	22	.67
Castile-Leon			
Santiago	2.1	13	2.38
Toledo	3.3	20	1.57
	5.4	33	1.82
France			
Treves	3.7	23	.85
Reims	6.1	37	1.38
Lyons	2.1	13	.56
Bourges	4.7	29	1.30
Narbonne	4.3	26	1.23
Rouen	2.6	16	.83
Sens	2.6	16	.91
Arles	1.8	11	1.24
Bourdeaux	1.4	9	1.05
	29.3	180	1.03
Brittany			
Tours	4.6	28	.71

CHART III (continued)

PERIOD III: FEBRUARY, 1434-SEPTEMBER, 1437	C	B	H
Savoy			
Milan (pt.)	.4	3	.25
Besançon (pt.)	.4	3	.43
Vienne	1.3	8	.47
Tarentaise	.1	1	.11
Embrun	.9	6	1.10
	3.1	21	.33
Germany			
Mainz, S.	7.7	47	.97
Cologne	6.9	42	1.06
Mainz, N.	5.1	31	1.11
Salzburg	2.9	18	.66
Magdeburg	1.8	11	1.24
	24.4	149	.93

PERIOD IV: OCTOBER, 1431 - JUNE, 1439	C	B	H
Aragon			
Saragossa	2.3%	8	1.95
Tarragona	11.0	38	3.01
Valencia	1.4	5	2.86
	14.7	51	2.76
Castile-Leon			
Santiago	---	--	----
Toledo	.8	3	.40
France			
Treves	7.5	26	1.72
Reims	1.7	6	.38
Lyons	4.0	14	1.07
Bourges	4.0	14	1.10
Narbonne	4.9	17	1.38
Rouen	3.7	13	1.19
Sens	4.6	16	1.61
Arles	.5	2	.38
Bourdeaux	---	---	----
	30.9	108	1.08

CHART III (continued)

PERIOD IV: OCTOBER, 1431 - JUNE, 1439	C	B	H
Brittany			
Tours	3.7	13	.59
Savoy			
Milan (pt.)	1.1	5	.75
Besançon (pt.)	.5	20	.46
Vienne	1.4	5	.52
Tarentaise	.5	2	.60
Embrun	.5	2	.64
	4.0	34	1.12
Germany			
Mainz, S.	6.9	24	.87
Cologne	11.0	38	1.69
Mainz, N.	4.3	15	.94
Salzburg	7.8	27	1.76
Magdeburg	.8	3	.59
	30.8	107	1.18

PERIOD V: JULY, 1439-JULY, 1440	C	A	H
Aragon			
Saragossa	1.6%	6	1.38
Tarragona	3.2	12	.87
Valencia	1.0	4	2.16
	5.8	22	1.12
Castile-Leon			
Santiago	---	---	----
Toledo	.8	3	.40
France			
Treves	3.5	13	.80
Reims	1.0	4	.24
Lyons	5.4	20	1.45
Bourges	1.6	6	.44
Narbonne	2.7	10	.76

CHART III (continued)

PERIOD V: JULY, 1439-JULY, 1440	C	A	H
Rouen	2.1	8	.69
Sens	1.3	5	.47
Arles	.5	2	.37
Bourdeaux	1.9	7	1.36
	20.0	75	.71
Brittany			
Tours	15.6	57	2.45
Savoy			
Milan (pt.)	6.5	24	3.44
Besançon (pt.)	2.7	10	2.44
Vienne	5.7	21	2.08
Tarentaise	3.2	12	3.44
Embrun	1.0	4	1.22
	19.1	71	2.25
Germany			
Mainz, S.	7.1	26	.87
Cologne	7.6	28	1.18
Mainz, N.	4.1	15	.89
Salzburg	3.0	11	.69
Magdeburg	.8	3	.55
	22.6	83	.86

APPENDIX II

THE RANKS AND OFFICES OF THE FATHERS OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The data relative to the ranks and offices of the Fathers are presented here in four sections. Section I is a list of the ranks and offices attributed to the Fathers by the sources, as well as the numbers of persons attributed to each rank or office. Sections II and III present the data relative to episcopal and abbatial representation. Since Bishops and Abbots were often represented through proctors as well as by personal attendance the charts present the figures for the principals, the proctors, and the combination of these two. Section IV presents the data relative to the incorporations of parish priests.

CHART I

ROSTER OF RANKS AND OFFICES

Canon	475	Scholasticus	20
Dean	63	Episcopal Vicar	18
total	538	Preceptor	18
Abbott	216	Personal Chaplain	14
Prior	205	Clericus	14
Bishop (including archbishop and patriarch)	128	Provincial of an Order	14
Provost	104	Cardinal	12
Deacon (including sub- and archdeacon)	57	Beneficiatus	12
Cantor (including precentor ans succentor)	23	Treasurer	11
Officialis curiae apostolicae	22	Officialis	9
Parish Cleric	253	Lector	8
Plebanus	14	Sacristan	8
total	267	Familiaris	7

CHART I (continued)

General of an Order	6	Prebendatus	2
Inquisitor	5		
Almoner	5		
Custos	4		
Chamberlain	4		
Infirmarius	3		
Cubicularis	2		

NOTE: This roster presents a complete list of ranks and offices imputed to the Fathers by the incorporation records. The titles and designations have been left in Latin in those cases where the office or title is no longer used or is little known or where the title is ambiguous, as "familiaris," "prebendatus," or "beneficiatus." Eight clerics were incorporated simply as "electi." It is possible that some of the clerics incorporated as *lector*, sacristan, *cantor*, treasurer, almoner, etc., were in fact canons, but all of these offices exist in other corporations as well as colleges. The title "parish cleric" includes those incorporated as "*presbyteri ecclesiae parrochiae*" and "*rectores ecclesiae parrochiae*." The term "*plebanus*" probably denotes a parish priest but it can designate any cleric in the lower ranks.

SECTION II

EPISCOPAL REPRESENTATION

CHART I

EPISCOPAL REPRESENTATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CUMULATIVE

	Total	Total Bishops	Total Proctors
Mainz, N.	10	2	8
Mainz, S.	21	8	13
Cologne	10	1	9
Besançon	2	2	0
Rouen	10	8	2
Milan	24	12	12
Tours	5	1	4
Salzburg	11	2	9
Reims	7	0	7
Vienne	8	6	2
Lyons	6	2	4
Trier	3	2	1
Bourges	8	2	6
Aquileia	7	5	2
Toledo	9	2	7
Narbonne	4	2	2
Tarragona	5	3	2
Genoa	3	2	1
Arles	2	1	1
Sens	3	2	1
Bourdeaux	3	1	2
Tarentaise	3	2	1
Santiago	6	1	5
Ravenna	6	4	2
Gnesen	3	0	3
Magdeburg	7	2	5
Riga	7	3	4
Saragossa	3	3	0
Prague	2	1	1
Dalmatia	4	3	1
Crete, Greece	6	6	0
Bremen	4	1	3
Gran	4	2	2
Venice	2	2	0
Embrun	3	2	1
Italy	5	3	2
Valencia	2	2	0

CHART I (continued)

	Total	Total Bishops	Total Proctors
Toulouse	3	0	3
Seville	1	1	0
Evola	1	0	1
Braga	2	1	1
Lund-Upsala	3	2	1
Scotland	5	4	1
Ireland	6	5	1
	249	116	133

CHART II

EPISCOPAL REPRESENTATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CUMULATIVE FOR PERIODS II, III, IV, AND V

	Sees Represented	Percent of Total	Numbers of Bishops	Percent of Total	Numbers of Proctors	Percent of Total
Mainz, N.	10	4.4%	2	1.8%	8	6.6%
Mainz, S.	17	7.6	8	7.5	9	7.5
Cologne	9	4.0	1	.9	8	6.6
Besançon	1	.4	1	.9	0	
Rouen	6	2.6	4	3.7	2	1.6
Milan	23	10.3	11	10.3	12	10.0
Tours	5	2.2	1	.9	4	3.4
Salzburg	9	4.0	2	1.8	7	5.8
Reims	6	2.6	0		6	5.0
Vienne	7	3.1	5	4.7	2	1.6
Lyons	5	2.2	2	1.8	3	2.5
Trier	1	.4	1	.9	0	
Bourges	8	3.5	2	1.8	6	5.0
Aquileia	6	2.6	4	3.7	2	1.6
Toledo	9	4.0	2	1.8	7	5.8
Narbonne	4	1.7	2	1.8	2	1.6
Tarragona	5	2.2	3	2.8	2	1.6
Genoa	3	1.3	2	1.8	1	.9
Arles	2	.8	1	.9	1	.9
Sens	3	1.3	2	1.8	1	.9
Bourdeaux	2	.8	0		2	1.6
Tarantaise	3	1.3	2	1.8	1	.9
Santiago	6	2.6	1	.9	5	4.1

CHART II (continued)

	Sees Represented	Percent of Total	Number of Bishops	Percent of Total	Number of Proctors	Percent of Total
Ravenna	6	2.6%	4	3.7%	2	1.6%
Gnesen	3	1.3	0		3	2.5
Magdeburg	7	3.1	2	1.8	5	4.1
Riga	7	3.1	3	2.8	4	3.4
Saragossa	3	1.3	3	2.8	0	
Prague	1	.4	1	.9	0	
Dalmatia	4	1.7	3	2.8	1	.9
Crete, Greece	6	2.6	6	5.6	0	
Bremen	3	1.3	1	.9	2	1.6
Gran	3	1.3	2	1.8	1	.9
Venice	2	.8	2	1.8	0	
Ebrun	2	.8	1	.9	1	.9
Italy	5	2.2	3	2.8	2	1.6
Valencia	2	.8	2	1.8	0	
Toulouse	3	1.3	0		3	2.5
Seville	1	.4	1	.9	0	
Evola	1	.4	0		1	.9
Braga	1	.4	1	.9	1	.9
Lund-Upsala	3	1.3	2	1.8	1	.9
Scotland	4	1.7	3	2.8	1	.9
Ireland	6	2.6	5	4.7	1	.9
	224		104		120	

CHART III

EPISCOPAL REPRESENTATION FOR PERIODS II, III, IV, AND V

	PERIOD II			PERIOD III		
	Number*	Percent of Total**	RPI***	Number*	Percentage of Total**	RPI***
Bishops	62	59.6%	2.61	28	26.9%	.61
Proctors	65	54.1	2.37	49	40.8	.93
Total	127	56.9	2.49	77	34.5	.79
	PERIOD IV			PERIOD V		
Bishops	9	8.6%	.41	5	4.8%	.37
Proctors	5	4.1	.19	1	.8	.06
Total	14	6.2	.29	6	2.6	.20

*Total number arriving in period.

**Percentage of the total number arriving in the particular period.

***Relative Proportion Index. The "RPI" is derived by dividing the percentage of a given class arriving in a given period of the "Council" by a percentage of the timespan of the "Council" embraced by the same period. Its function is to equate the arrivals of the various periods with one another despite the varying lengths of the periods.

CHART IV

EPISCOPAL REPRESENTATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA FOR ALL PERIODS

	PERIOD I			PERIOD II		
	Total	Bishops	Proctors	Total	Bishops	Proctors
Mainz, N.	0	0	0	8	2	6
Mainz, S.	4	0	4	11	5	6
Cologne	1	0	1	7	1	6
Besançon	1	1	0	0	0	0
Rouen	4	4	0	3	2	1
Milan	1	1	0	14	8	6
Tours	0	0	0	4	1	3
Salzburg	2	0	2	5	0	5
Reims	1	0	1	6	0	6
Vienne	0	0	0	4	3	1
Lyons	1	0	1	3	2	1
Trier	2	1	1	0	0	0
Bourges	0	0	0	3	1	2
Aquileia	0	0	0	5	3	2
Toledo	0	0	0	3	1	2
Narbonne	0	0	0	2	1	1
Tarragona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Genoa	0	0	0	3	2	1
Arles	0	0	0	1	1	0
Sens	0	0	0	2	1	1
Bourdeaux	1	1	0	0	0	0
Tarentaise	0	0	0	1	0	1
Santiago	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ravenna	0	0	0	6	4	2
Gnesen	0	0	0	2	0	2
Magdeburg	0	0	0	5	1	4
Riga	0	0	0	5	2	3
Saragossa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prague	0	0	0	1	1	0
Dalmatia	0	0	0	2	1	1
Crete, Greece	0	0	0	6	6	0
Bremen	1	0	1	2	1	1
Gran	1	0	1	1	1	0
Venice	0	0	0	1	1	0
Embrun	0	0	0	2	1	1
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Valencia	0	0	0	0	0	0

CHART IV (continued)

	PERIOD I			PERIOD II		
	Total	Bishops	Proctors	Total	Bishops	Proctors
Toulouse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seville	0	0	0	1	1	0
Evola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Braga	0	0	0	1	1	0
Lund-Upsala	0	0	0	2	2	0
Scotland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ireland	0	0	0	5	5	0
	20	8	12	127	62	65

	PERIOD III			PERIOD IV		
	Total	Bishops	Proctors	Total	Bishops	Proctors
Mainz, N.	2	0	2	0	0	0
Mainz, S.	5	3	2	0	0	0
Cologne	2	0	2	0	0	0
Besançon	0	0	0	1	1	0
Rouen	3	2	1	0	0	0
Milan	4	0	4	4	2	2
Tours	1	0	1	0	0	0
Salzburg	3	1	2	1	1	0
Reims	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vienne	0	0	0	1	0	1
Lyons	2	0	2	0	0	0
Trier	1	1	0	0	0	0
Bourges	5	1	4	0	0	0
Aquileia	1	1	0	0	0	0
Toledo	6	1	5	0	0	0
Narbonne	2	1	1	0	0	0
Tarragona	4	3	1	1	0	1
Genoa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arles	1	0	1	0	0	0
Sens	0	0	0	1	1	0
Bourdeaux	2	0	2	0	0	0
Tarentaise	0	0	0	0	0	0
Santiago	6	1	5	0	0	0

CHART IV (continued)

	PERIOD III			PERIOD IV		
	Total	Bishops	Proctors	Total	Bishops	Proctors
Ravenna	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gnesen	1	0	1	0	0	0
Magdeburg	1	0	1	1	1	0
Riga	2	1	1	0	0	0
Saragossa	2	2	0	1	1	0
Prague	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dalmatia	2	2	0	0	0	0
Crete, Greece	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bremen	1	0	1	0	0	0
Gran	2	1	1	0	0	0
Venice	1	1	0	0	0	0
Embrun	0	0	0	0	0	0
Italy	5	3	2	0	0	0
Valencia	0	0	0	2	2	0
Toulouse	3	0	3	0	0	0
Seville	0	0	0	0	0	0
Evola	1	0	1	0	0	0
Braga	1	0	1	0	0	0
Lund-Upsala	0	0	0	1	0	1
Scotland	4	3	1	0	0	0
Ireland	1	0	1	0	0	0
	77	28	49	14	9	5

	PERIOD V			PERIOD VI		
	Total	Bishops	Proctors	Total	Bishops	Proctors
Mainz, N.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mainz, S.	1	0	1	0	0	0
Cologne	0	0	0	0	0	0
Besançon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rouen	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milan	1	1	0	0	0	0
Tours	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salzburg	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reims	0	0	0	0	0	0

CHART IV (continued)

	PERIOD V			PERIOD VI		
	Total	Bishops	Proctors	Total	Bishops	Proctors
Vienne	2	2	0	1	1	0
Lyons	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trier	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bourges	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aquileia	0	0	0	1	1	0
Toledo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Narbonne	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tarragona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Genoa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bourdeaux	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tarentaise	2	2	0	0	0	0
Santiago	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ravenna	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gnesen	0	0	0	0	0	0
Magdeburg	0	0	0	0	0	0
Riga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saragossa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prague	0	0	0	1	0	1
Dalmatia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crete, Greece	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bremen	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gran	0	0	0	0	0	0
Venice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embrun	0	0	0	1	1	0
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Valencia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Toulouse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seville	0	0	0	0	0	0
Evola	0	0	0	0	0	0
Braga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lund-Upsala	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scotland	0	0	0	1	1	0
Ireland	0	0	0	0	0	0
	6	5	1	5	4	1

SECTION III

ABBATIAL REPRESENTATION

CHART I

ABBATIAL REPRESENTATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CUMULATIVE

	Total	Abbots	Proctors
Mainz, N.	11	8	3
Mainz, S.	21	20	1
Cologne	12	12	0
Besançon	10	9	1
Rouen	7	6	1
Milan	31	26	5
Tours	7	7	0
Salzburg	11	9	2
Reims	11	7	4
Vienne	9	8	1
Lyons	11	8	3
Trier	12	10	2
Bourges	12	10	2
Aquileia	4	4	0
Narbonne	2	2	0
Toledo	4	3	1
Tarragona	5	5	0
Genoa	13	8	5
Arles	1	1	0
Sens	4	4	0
Bourdeaux	4	3	1
Santiago	3	3	0
Ravenna	7	7	0
Gnesen	2	2	0
Magdeburg	2	2	0
Saragossa	1	1	0
Prague	1	1	0
Dalmatia	1	1	0
Venice	2	2	0
Embrun	1	1	0
Burgos	3	3	0
Auch	2	1	1
Aix	4	4	0
Toulouse	1	1	0
Pisa, Siena	2	2	0
Glasgow	1	1	0
	235	202	33

CHART II

ABBATIAL REPRESENTATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CUMULATIVE FOR PERIODS II, III, IV, AND V

	Abbots and Proctors	Percent of Total
Mainz, N.	10	4.7%
Mainz, S.	20	9.4
Cologne	9	4.2
Besançon	7	3.3
Rouen	6	2.8
Milan	30	14.1
Tours	7	3.3
Salzburg	10	4.7
Reims	9	4.2
Vienne	7	3.3
Lyons	10	4.7
Trier	11	5.1
Bourges	11	5.1
Aquileia	3	1.4
Narbonne	2	.9
Toledo	4	1.8
Tarragona	5	2.3
Genoa	13	6.1
Arles	1	.4
Sens	4	1.8
Bourdeaux	4	1.8
Santiago	3	1.4
Ravenna	7	3.3
Gnesen	1	.4
Magdeburg	2	.9
Saragossa	1	.4
Prague	1	.4
Dalmatia	1	.4
Venice	2	.9
Embrun	-	---
Burgos	3	1.4
Auch	2	.9
Aix	3	1.4
Toulouse	1	.4
Pisa, Siena	1	.4
Glasgow	1	.4
	212	

CHART III

ABBATIAL REPRESENTATION FOR PERIODS II, III, IV, AND V

	SECOND PERIOD			THIRD PERIOD		
	Number*	Percent of Total **	RPI***	Number*	Percent of Total**	RPI***
Abbots	63	35%	1.53	69	38.3 %	.87
Abbots and Proctors	85	40	1.75	79	37.2	.85
	FOURTH PERIOD			FIFTH PERIOD		
Abbots	25	13.8%	.66	23	12.7%	.83
Abbots and Proctors	25	11.7	.56	23	10.8	.98

*Total number arriving in period.

**Percentage of the total number arriving in the particular period.

***Relative Proportion Index. The "RPI" is derived by dividing the percentage of a given class arriving in a given period of the Council by the percentage of the timespan of the Council embraced by the same period. Its function is to equate the arrivals of the various periods with one another, despite the varying lengths of the periods.

CHART IV

ABBATIAL REPRESENTATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA FOR ALL PERIODS

	PERIOD I			PERIOD II		
	Total	Abbots	Proctors	Total	Abbots	Proctors
Mainz, N.	0	0	0	1	0	1
Mainz, S.	1	1	0	6	5	1
Cologne	3	3	0	2	2	0
Besançon	2	2	0	5	4	1
Rouen	1	1	0	3	2	1
Milan	0	0	0	17	14	3
Tours	0	0	0	1	1	0
Salaburg	0	0	0	5	4	1
Reims	2	1	1	4	1	3
Vienne	1	1	0	4	3	1
Lyons	1	1	0	5	2	3
Trier	1	1	0	3	1	2
Bourges	1	1	0	8	7	1
Aquileia	0	0	0	1	1	0
Narbonne	0	0	0	0	0	0
Toledo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tarragona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Genoa	0	0	0	10	6	4
Arles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bourdeaux	0	0	0	1	1	0
Santiago	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ravenna	0	0	0	3	3	0
Gnesen	0	0	0	1	1	0
Magdeburg	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saragossa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prague	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dalmatia	0	0	0	1	1	0
Venice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embrun	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burgos	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auch	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aix	0	0	0	3	3	0
Toulouse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pisa, Siena	0	0	0	0	0	0
Glasgow	0	0	0	1	1	0
	13	12	1	85	63	22

CHART IV (continued)

	PERIOD III			PERIOD IV		
	Total	Abbots	Proctors	Total	Abbots	Proctors
Mainz, N.	9	7	2	0	0	0
Mainz, S.	9	9	0	1	1	0
Cologne	6	6	0	1	1	0
Besançon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rouen	2	2	0	1	1	0
Milan	6	4	2	2	2	0
Tours	4	4	0	1	1	0
Salzburg	3	2	1	2	2	0
Reims	3	3	0	1	1	0
Vienne	1	1	0	0	0	0
Lyons	1	1	0	2	2	0
Trier	4	4	0	4	4	0
Bourges	3	2	1	0	0	0
Aquileia	0	0	0	1	1	0
Narbonne	0	0	0	1	1	0
Toledo	3	2	1	1	1	0
Tarragona	0	0	0	4	4	0
Genoa	3	2	1	0	0	0
Arles	1	1	0	0	0	0
Sens	2	2	0	2	2	0
Bourdeaux	2	1	1	0	0	0
Santiago	3	3	0	0	0	0
Ravenna	3	3	0	1	1	0
Gnesen	0	0	0	0	0	0
Magdeburg	2	2	0	0	0	0
Saragossa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prague	1	1	0	0	0	0
Dalmatia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Venice	2	2	0	0	0	0
Embrun	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burgos	3	3	0	0	0	0
Auch	2	1	1	0	0	0
Aix	0	0	0	0	0	0
Toulouse	1	1	0	0	0	0
Pisa, Siena	0	0	0	0	0	0
Glasgow	0	0	0	0	0	0
	79	69	10	25	25	0

CHART IV (continued)

	PERIOD V			PERIOD VI		
	Total	Abbots	Proctors	Total	Abbots	Proctors
Mainz, N.	0	0	0	1	1	0
Mainz, S.	4	4	0	0	0	0
Cologne	0	0	0	0	0	0
Besançon	2	2	0	1	1	0
Rouen	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milan	5	5	0	1	1	0
Tours	1	1	0	0	0	0
Salzburg	0	0	0	1	1	0
Reims	1	1	0	0	0	0
Vienne	2	2	0	1	1	0
Lyons	2	2	0	0	0	0
Trier	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bourges	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aquileia	1	1	0	1	1	0
Narbonne	1	1	0	0	0	0
Toledo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tarragona	1	1	0	0	0	0
Genoa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bourdeaux	1	1	0	0	0	0
Santiago	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ravenna	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gnesen	0	0	0	1	1	0
Magdeburg	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saragossa	1	1	0	0	0	0
Prague	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dalmatia	0	0	0	0	0	0
Venice	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embrun	0	0	0	1	1	0
Burgos	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auch	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aix	0	0	0	1	1	0
Toulouse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pisa, Siena	1	1	0	1	1	0
Glasgow	0	0	0	0	0	0
	23	23	0	10	10	0

SECTION IV

INCORPORATIONS OF PARISH PRIESTS

CHART I

INCORPORATIONS OF PARISH PRIESTS BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA: CUMULATIVE FOR PERIODS II, III, IV, AND V

	Total Council	Percent of Total Council	Percent of Period V
Mainz, N.	11	5.0%	6.4%
Mainz, S.	15	6.8	7.9
Cologne	19	8.7	9.3
Besançon	23	10.5	9.3
Rouen	9	4.1	5.0
Milan	4	1.8	2.1
Tours	41	18.8	20.8
Salzburg	10	4.5	2.8
Reims	8	3.6	.7
Vienne	5	2.2	2.8
Lyons	10	4.5	5.7
Trier	9	4.1	5.0
Bourges	2	.9	.7
Aquileia	1	.4	.7
Narbonne	5	2.2	2.1
Toledo	3	1.3	1.4
Tarragona	4	1.8	2.1
Arles	4	1.8	1.4
Sens	2	.9	0
Bourdeaux	3	1.3	1.4
Tarentaise	4	1.8	2.1
Ravenna	1	.4	0
Gnesen	2	.9	.7
Riga	2	.9	1.4
Saragossa	3	1.3	1.4
Prague	0	0	0
Crete, Greece	1	.4	0
Bremen	1	.4	0
Pomerania	2	.9	1.4
Venice	1	.4	0
Valencia	6	2.7	2.1
Auch	2	.9	1.4
Toulouse	1	.4	.7
Braga	1	.4	0
Pisa, Siena	1	.4	0
Lund, Upsala	1	.4	0
Scotland	1	.4	0
	218		

CHART II

INCORPORATIONS OF PARISH PRIESTS FOR PERIODS II, III, IV, AND V

Period	Number*	Percent of Total**	RPI***
II	15	6.8%	.29
III	37	16.9	.38
IV	27	12.3	.59
V	139	63.7	4.94

*Total number arriving in period.

**Percentage of the total number arriving in the particular period.

***Relative Proportion Index. The "RPI" is derived by dividing the percentage of a given class arriving in a given period of the Council by the percentage of the time span of the Council embraced by the same period. Its function is to equate the arrivals of the various periods with one another despite the varying lengths of the periods.

CHART III

INCORPORATIONS OF PARISH PRIESTS BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA FOR ALL PERIODS

	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Mainz, N.	0	1	1	9	1	12
Mainz, S.	0	1	3	11	1	16
Cologne	1	3	2	13	2	21
Besançon	2	2	6	13	2	25
Rouen	0	1	1	7	0	9
Milan	1	0	0	3	0	4
Tours	1	9	2	29	2	43
Salzburg	2	1	3	4	1	11
Reims	1	6	0	1	0	8
Vienne	0	1	0	4	2	7
Lyons	1	1	0	8	1	11
Trier	1	1	0	7	0	9
Bourges	0	1	0	1	0	2
Aquileia	0	0	0	1	2	3
Narbonne	0	1	1	3	1	6
Toledo	0	1	0	2	0	3
Arles	1	0	1	2	0	4
Tarragona	0	0	1	3	1	5
Sens	2	0	0	0	0	2
Bourdeaux	1	0	0	2	0	3
Tarentaise	0	0	1	3	2	6
Ravenna	0	1	0	0	0	1
Gnesen	0	0	1	1	0	2
Riga	0	0	0	2	0	2
Saragossa	0	0	1	2	0	3
Prague	0	0	0	0	1	1
Crete, Greece	0	1	0	0	0	1
Bremen	0	1	0	0	0	1
Pomerania	0	0	0	2	1	3
Venice	0	1	0	0	0	1
Valencia	0	1	2	3	0	6
Auch	0	0	0	2	1	3
Toulouse	0	0	0	1	0	1
Braga	0	0	1	0	0	1
Pisa, Siena	0	1	0	0	0	1
Lund, Upsala	1	0	0	0	0	1
Scotland	0	1	0	0	0	1
	15	37	27	139	21	239

NOTE: There were no parish priests incorporated in Period I.

APPENDIX III

REGISTER OF INCORPORATIONS *

---

* Key to abbreviations, see pages 379, 380.

ep. Ebrodonensis (Aberdon.), (Henricus de Leighton), 30/3/34

Nic. de Sola, decr. doc., off. Abrinc. pro ep. et cap. Abrinc., licet pro abbatibus S. Michaelis et Bellobecho, 4/5/32

pr. de Spissocampo, o.s.A., Ambian. dio, pro abb. s. Martini ad Gemellos et s. Achoeli, iuxta Ambian. (Andreas Clerici), 23/2/32

fr. Theodoricus Maer, religiosus, pro ab. s. Adalberti, Traiect. dio., o.s.B., 5/3/34

Adam de Gordon, bac. in decr., Dunkeld., et Moravi., eccl. can., vic. perpetuus eccl. parr. de Craumone dicte dio. Dunkeld., 14/10/35

Adam Molens, lic. in leg., Anglicus, 7/3/33

fr. Adam de Pueraux, ab. elect. Rothomag., 4/38

Adam de Till, thes. Trauemburg., Colon., 9/37

mag. Ademarus de Roussilione, can. Lugdun., in decr. lic., promotor huius concilii, 13/2/32

Adrianus Clerici, 23/1/34

ep. Adriensis, (Jacobus Bertucci d'Ohizzi), 12/5/33

Aeneas Picolomini de Senis, fam. card. Firmani, 9/8/32 ;
-proc. card. Firmani, 9/8/32

Agantus Arnaudi, can. Ebredun., 1/7/40

Ymbertum de Chissiaco, lic. in leg., precentor Biterr., adm. est pro et nom. cap. Agath., 5/5/33

mag. Anthonius Procheti, lic. in decr., off. Agath. pro se et ep. Agath., 9/4/34

Aymericus Bailloti, lic. in decr., pr. priorat. Calvimontis Mirapic. dio., o. can. reg., 17/12/34

Aymericus de Harpaione, 19/6/33
-pro ep. Vabri., 9/4/34

fr. Aymericus de Salnier, bac. in theo., 24/10/32

Aymo, ejus monachus, 23/10/39

fr. Aymo de Castellione, camerarius s. Eugendi Jur., Lugdun., dio., 17/6/40

Aymo Hugenini, pr. claustralis priorat. s. Petri de Lunento, o.s.B., Gracioni-politan. dio, de licencia, pr. dicti priorat., 23/7/40

Aymo Magumi, o.P., et theo. professor, 1-2/42

Aymonetus de Provanis, prep. s. Marie de Vigerio, o.s.B., Taurin. dio., decr. doc., 23/12/39

Aynardus de Luriaco, pr. Giniaci, o. Clun., Lausan. dio., 31/10/40

Ayquilinus de Vinhali, capellanus legati, prep. s. Severini extra muros Burdegal. (Anselmus Burdegal.), 23/9/32;
-proc. d. ep. Sarlat., 26/5/33

Alanus de Cokadoney, in leg. lic., 12/38

Alanus Guerinset, bac. in decr., rect. parr. eccl. de Laudawervey, Leon. dio., nobili ex utroque parente, 27/5/40

fr. Alanus de Lambilis, pr. de Comburno, o.s.B., Maclovi. dio., 1/12/36

Alanus Scotorum, s. Iacobi. Ratispon., secularis ab., 9/38

ab. de Albavalle, 14/5/32

Joh., doc. in theo., uni. Wien., nuncius ducis Albertus Austrie, proc. u. Wien., 5/7/32

Joh. Celi, amb. u. Wien., Alberti ducis Austriae, prov. Bavarie, o. A., 5/7/32

Alb. Baemer, can. s. Stephani, 6/7/36

Alb. de Crispis, pr. provincialis Lombardi., o. fr. Augustin., mag. in theo., 24/10/32

mag. Alb. de Ferrariis, utr. jur. doc., proc. d. ep. Placentini 13/6/32;
-adm. est. proc. cap. Placentin. et ab. s. Savini de Placenci., 12/11/32

Alb. Greue, in decr. lic., 8/37

Alb. Grippes, cant. eccl. b. Marie Stetin., Camin. dio., 29/10/40

Alb., prep. Misn., 17/6/33

Alb., pleb. eccl. s. Sewardi, Nuremberg., mag. in. art., 19/3/34

Alb. Pisanus de Cicilia, leg. doc., 25/2/47

Alb. Rorde, vic. in eccl., Monasteri., 31/7/39

Alb. Schenck de Limporch, decr. doc., can. Herbipol. et proc. cap. Herbipol., 6/6/32

mag. Alb. de Viadin, pro arep. Strigoni., 25/8/36

Alb. de Zuytkecke, can. eccl. s. Petri Tarentasi., o. can. reg. s. A., 10/11/41

ep. Albingan., amb. ducis Mediolan., 16/4/32 (Matthaeus del Carreto);
-pro Italice, 15/7/32

fr. Aldradus de Jaliono, infirmarius s. Justi de Secusia, o.s.B., 26/10/39

Aleramus de Carreto, ab. Fructuari., dio. Yporrig., 25/6/39

Alexander, decr. doc. eximius, ab. mon. Virziliac., o.s.B., Edu. dio., 28/2/31

Patriarcha Alexandrinus, 5/5/33 (Vitalis de Mauleon)

Alexius Ploech, presb. pleb. eccl. parr. opidi Holland, Poncezani. dio., 10/11/41

Alexius Stecle, presb. rect. parr. eccl. in Wethouun, 30/4/32;
-proc. Franciscus Luppi mon.s. Ruperti, 30/4/32

Alfonsus Alvari, can. Toletan., 28/7/36

Alf. Carrigle, prothonotarius sedis apost., 11/4/33

Alf. Carrillo, sedis apost. prothonotarius, pro rege Castelle, 22/10/34

Alf. Didaci, can. eccl. Placentin., bac. in dec., 10/9/34

Alf. Garcie de s. Maria, leg. doc., dec. Compostellan., pro rege Castelle, 22/10/34

Alf. Garcie, leg. doc., proc. d. arep. Compostellan. et dd. ep. Burg. et ep. Oxom., 22/10/34

Alf. Garsie, ardiac. in eccl Placentina, 14/7/36

fr. Alf., o.s. Joh. Jher., 28/11/32

Alf. Lupi de Heredia, bac. in decr., can. eccl. Conch. et Raymundus Taloni, pro et nom. mag. Guillermi de Lira, 21/10/35

Alf. de la Puebla s. Marie de Mercede irdinum, in theo. bac., 11/37

Alf. de Solis, in. leg. bac., servitor d. card. s. Petri ad vincula, 29/11/32

fr. Alfonxius de Sommora, pr. s. Nerici de Placencia, 16/1/34

Alivi Cointivi, prep s. Martini, Turon., 20/7/36

Allanus de Kerrunel diac., bac. in leg., rect. eccl. parr. de Querpernon, Trecor. dio., de nobili genere procreatus, 9/10/39

Anshelmus Eychorne, fr. hospitalis b. Marie Theut., bac. in leg., pro mag. Almanie ejusdem o., 2/1/40

ab. Altesilve, o. Cist., 10/2/36

Alvarus Alfonsi, Colimbri. dio., decr. doc., 1-6/43

Alvarusde Jarana, scol. Conch., 10/2/33

Alvarus de Ysorna, ep. Conch., pro. parte regis Castelle, 22/10/34

fr. Amadeus, pr. de Donzera, pro. ab. Trenorchi., 16/4/34

mag. Jacobus Robaille, can. Ambian., pro cap. Ambian. et nom. proprio, 30/5/32

Thom. de Courcellis, nom. d. ep. Ambian., 24/4/33

Ambrosius, pleb. s. Vitalis et can. Moton., presb., 30/4/34

Ambrosius de Pantulo, decr. doc., 4/37

mag. Ambrosius de Vassiburga, mag. in art., rect. parr. eccl. in Frinsingha, 16/4/34

Petrus de Poris, ardiac. de Camares, nom. ep. Ambul., 10/9/34

Amedeus de Castillione, sacrista Nantuac., bac. in dec., 14/10/35

fr. Amedeus de Chenansenay, pro priorat. conventualis Talleria., Gebenn, dio., bac. in decr., 16/10/39

Amedeus de Luyriaco, ardiac. Valentin., 8/37

Amedeus Monachi, cant. et can. eccl. Gebenn., nom. cap. Gebenn., 23/11/41

Guido de Vercellis, mag., bac. in theo., adm. pro et nom. ep. Andegav., 8/6/33

Mattheus Maignage, adm. pro ep. Andegav., 8/6/33
-proc. ep. et cap. Andegav., 12/6/33

ab. s. Nicolaus Andegavi., 3/8/33

fr. Andreas, o.M., in theo. bac., 22/10/34

Andreas de Brolio, pr. s. Saturnini, Vienn. dio., prope Saleriam, 10/2/36

Andreas Citariensis, ep., 11-12/42

pr. de Spissocampo, o.s.A., Ambian. dio., pro abb. s. Martini ad Gemellos et s. Achoeli iuxta Ambian., 23/2/32 (Andreas Clerici)

Andreas Dolino, can. Wratislavi., 16/1/34

And. Dominici, pleb. eccl. col., dio. Castellane, bac. form. in theo., 5/3/34

fr. And. de Feilliens, pr. Tononii, o.s.B., Gebenn. dio., 1/7/40

And. Flagelleti, Lugdun. dio., lic. in decr., presb., 29/10/39

fr. And. de Gassa, o. Aug., bac. form. in theo., 6/38

fr. And. Gilberti, in theo. lic., 8/38

And. Hasselman, decr. doc., 1/38

fr. And. Pfaffendorf et duo doc. seculares (lecto mandato dd. de Prussia) (religiosus o. Prutenorum), 7/4/33 mag. And. Samtperg, mag. in art., rect. eccl. parr. in Straspre, Culm. dio, 25/6/40

ab. s. Andree de Sexto, o. Cist., 25/4/32

fr. And. Stosser, 3/9/34

And. Theoderici, rect. parr. eccl. s. Mauricii, Colon., bac. in decr., 3/11/36

And., pleb. eccl. coll. s. Blasii de Veneciis, 30/4/34

And. Vitalis, 9/2/33

fr. Angelius Alipudus de Vocana, Veron. dio., pr. s. Appolinaris, Veron. dio., 16/36

Angelotus de Pisis, can. Pisan., pro d. Juliano, ab. Monde Septimo, o. Cist., Florentin. dio., 7/9/36

Julianus, s. Angeli card., 9/9/31

fr. Angelus, pr. mon. s. Mathie de Moriano, Camaldul. o., Torsselan. dio., 2/4/34

Angelus de Crapanica, 18/11/34

Angelus de Perusio, utr. iur. doc., 10/12/34

Angelus de Pisis, can. Pisanus, 24/4/33

d.Angladus de Busbach, scol. eccl. b. Marie in Turstach extra muros Bamberg., 7/7/41

provincialis Anglie, o. Carm., 13/10/32

Joh. de Ronuceyo, mag. in theo., can. Bituric., et ep. Anici., 4/11/33

thesaurius Anici., 4/11/33

Anselmus, capel. d. legati, 10/10/32

Anselmus de Fausonay, dec. Valie in eccl. Sedun., 23/11/39

fr. Anselmus Ogerii, mag. in theo., o. Carm., 23/12/35

mag. Joh. Flabhardi, prep. eccl. Anselzip., Lausan. dio., pro se et cap., 8/8/32

Anshelmus Eychorne, fr. hospitalis b. Marie Theut., bac. in leg., pro mag. Almanie ejusdem o., 2/1/40

patriarcha Anthiochenos, 19/9/32 (Johannes)
-proc. comes de Villariis, 30/6/33

Hugo de Bellomonte, precept. s. Anth. Basili., nom. ab. s. Anth. 16/5/32

fr. --- o.s. Anth. pro ab. s. Anth., 14/5/35

Anth., ab. s. Marie de Pratalia, o.s.B., Paduan. dio., 5/3/34

Anth. de Attria, can. s. Stephani, Constanci., 5/6/33

Anth. de Bernuelis de Parma, vic., 24/7/32

Anth. de Bernucciis, pro ep. Vratislavi., 8/7/35

Anth. de Borassiis, ardiac. Brissie in eccl. Cabilon., 13/11/33

fr. Anth. de Cadacasiis, s. Martini de Crama, Placentin. dio., prep., 9/38

Anth. de Cadranis, ardiac. et can. Vincentin., 5/3/34

fr. Anth., s. Martini de Camigone, Eln., 1-2/39

Anth., ab. de Castiono, Parm. dio., 10/9/34

Anth., pr. Clare Vallis iuxta Mediolan., 29/11/32

Anth. de Corduba, o.b. Marie de Mercede et theo. prof., 3/39

Anth. David, lic. in dec. cum rigore examinis, 19/3/34

Anth. Egidii, doc., can. Conch., 22/10/34

fr. Anth. Fornerii, pr. priorat. Noville, Lugdun. dio., 9/10/39

Anth. Glera in theo. et in decr. bac., 9/38

Anth. Gundissalui, in decr. bac., mag. in art., scol. eccl. Trivir., 6/8/35

Anth. de Ylano, decr. doc., 3/39

Anth. de Lentibiaco, pr. priorat. convent. Charmeliarum, pro se et ab. mon. s. Aufredi, Anici. dio., 1/10/34

Anth. Leotardi, pr. Traspinguis, Wien. dio., 9/3/36

Anth. de Longacula, Bellic. ardiac., 11-12/42

Anth. de Malispinis, decr. doc., can. Veron., 15/3/34

Anth. Merchandi, prep. Pinorolii, Gebenn. dio., mag. 1/7/40

fr. Anth. de Michaele, bac. form. in theo., 4/37

mag. Anth. de Mileto, bac. form. in theo., rect. parr. eccl. s. Leonis de Veneciis, 15/3/34

Anth. Mistralis, bac. in decr., pr. priorat. Grandissonis, Lausan. dio., pro et nomine ipsius adm. est pro ab. Case Dei, dio. Claromet., 20/5/33
-pro se, 22/5/33

fr. Anth. Multonis, 27/8/34

Anth. Munionis, in utr. doc., 10/38

mag. Anth. de Noyers, elect. Lingoni., 5/3/34

Anth. de Parma, pro et nom. habitatorum civitatum Bamberg., 30/8/32

Anth. Pelacano, pleb. ss. Apostolorum, 7/5/34

fr. Anth. Petri, Petrus penitencium, o.s.B., 6/38

mag. Anth. Procheti, lic. in decr., off. Agath., pro se et ep. Agath., 9/4/34

fr. Anth. de Roquaneto, o. heremit. s. A., 31/8/33

Anth. Ruscha, mag. in theo., o.M., 19/3/34

Anth. ab. Silvecave, o. Cist., 17/10/36

Anth. Stabuli, elect. Pact., 7/37

Anth., o.P., de Trepesonda Grecus, 12/38

Anth. Vicedoni, prep. s. Bartholomei extra muros Vercellensis, 1-2/42

proc. cap. Morian., vocatus d. Anth. la Viniaco, can. eiusdem eccl., 23/2/33
-proc. Joh. Curiis, 17/9/33

fr. Anth. de Ulphiaco, pr. priorat. s. Salvatoris in Rua, Wien. dio., bac. in dec., 7/34

Anth. Zweuenarde, secretarius ep. Tornac., 21/11/32

fr. Ant. Acrimontis, proc. et nom. mag. Natalis Gaber, pr. convent. Mercedis Barchinon. civitatis, 5/10/39

Ant. Barabonis, bac. in utr., Nemaus., 16/3/36

Ant. de Boronchio, can. Vercell., 17/11/41

Ant. de Capris, beneficiatus in plebinatu s. Laurencii Septimi Guitani, Yporrigium. dio., 23/12/39

Ant. Cipriani de Aretis, in theo. mag., elect. ad eccl. Aretinam, o.M., 15/9/36

Ant. Constantini, presb. rect. parr. eccl. de Novasella, Gebenn. dio., capel. in Christo p. d. card. de Varembone, 28/4/41

Ant. Doncastel, in utr. bac., 9/37

Ant. Durrati, can. eccl. b. Marie de Monte Calerio, Taurin. dio., cur. s. Petri de Caburreto dicte dio., 4/11/40

Ant. Ferrarii, prep. eccl. Ilerd., bac. in decr., 23/4/39

Ant. Font, in decr. bac., can. eccl. metropolitane Calaritane, 17/4/39

Ant. Glora, form. in theo., 9/37

Ant. Januarii, bac. in decr., rect. parr. eccl. in Combelles, Urgell. dio., 21/7/41

Ant. Obeileul, bac. in decr., cur. eccl. de Verayo, August. dio., 23/10/39

Ant. Oliverii, camerarius et can. in eccl. Dertus., decr. doc., 27/1/40

Ant. Perrini, presb. sacr. curat. parr. eccl. s. Laurencii de Sambuca, Gerund. dio., 27/5/40

Bernardus de Bosco, vic. Ilerd., pro d. Antonio, ab. mon. s. Petri Bisuldino, o.s.B., Gerund. dio., 22/5/39

Ant. de Prez, in decr. lic., 8/37

Ant. de Provanis, pr. priorat. Euginel, o.s.B., Gebenn. dio., 21/6/40

Ant. Servagii, pr. major monasterii de Jugo Dei, o.s.B., Lugdun. dio., 15/5/39

Ant. de Tosabeciis de Papia, decr. doc., ardiac. et can. Tridentin., 2/1/40

fr. Ant. de Varas, sacrista priorat. Tononii, Gebenn. dio., 1/7/40

Antredus de Atavilla, can. eccl. Leon., 23/12/35

prep. Aquebelle, nom. proc. d. ep. August. in Sabaudia et eciam nom. proprio, 12/12/32 (Joh. Curriis)

patriarcha Aquilegi., 7/10 (Ludovicus de Tek)

Doringocius de Melssio, can. Aquilegi., pro cap., 2/4/34

ep. Aquilinus, 15/5/33 (Guilelmus de Portuguario)

Petrus Toulet, religiosus Aquinstint., pro et nom. ab. Aquistint., Attrebat. dio., 28/3/32

d. elemosinarius d. regis Aragonum, 30/1/33

ep. Archadi., 12/2/34 (Petrus de Ceno)

Archibaldus Laurencii, can. eccl. Bethlemitane, mag. in art. et mag. hospitalis s. Germanii, dio. s. Andree in Scocia, 5/3/34

dec. eccl. Argentin. pro parte cap. eiusdem, 12/31

pr. Argentin. de Cart. o., 11/12/31

Godescaldus de Cimiterio, secr. d. ep. Argentin., pro dicto ep., 16/1/33

Nycolaus Lindenstrumpff, pro parte ep. Argentin., 12/31

off. Argentin., 8/4/32

pr. fr. Predicatorum, Argentin., 23/11/32

Arnandinus de Placescho, prep. s. Jacobi Curtis Vetule, Ast. dio., 17/3/41

Arnestus Putreich de Monaco, Frising. dio., mag. in art. et bac. in theo., 24/3/41

Arnoldus Amici, cursor, 25/6/34

mag. Arnoldus de Brenda, can. Herbipol., pro d. cant. Maguntin. et se ipso, 38/7/36

Arnoldus in Browile, Coloni. dio., ab., 3/37

Arn. ab. Brueer, o.s.B., Coloni. dio., 18/8/36

Arn. de Brughen, prep. metropolitane Rig., 22/10/34

Arn. de Busco, cursor receptus, 5/5/33

Arn. Nepotis, causarum proc., 28/3/38

Arn. Rakeluchesen, 4/3/35

mag. Arn. Risi, o. Aug., mag. in theo., 8/7/35

fr. Arn. Sabat, o. fr. heremit. s. Aug., bac. form. in theo., 23/12/35

Arn. Zagmeister, rect. parr. eccl. in Golnowe ac can. s. Otonis Stetin., Camin. dio., 6/2/40

Arnulphus Marelli, presb. Tull., rect. parr. eccl. de Sixeyo, Tull. dio., 18/3/40

ab. ss. Apostolorum extra muros Ast., 4/11/33

Marcus Milo, nom. proprio et cleri Ast., 14/5/33

Milo do Carraria, pro ep. Ast., 18/3/35

mag. Egidius Carleriis, mag. in sac. pag., ut proc. et nom. proc. ep. Attrebat., dec. Camerac., 3/2/32

Joh. Sparserii, pro d. Audeberto, prothonotario de Petra, 6/7/36

fr. --- religiosus S. Bertini de s. Audomar. tam pro parte ab. quam cap. s. Audomar., 3/22/32

dec. s. Audomar., 7/8/33

prep. s. Audomar., 2/10/33

Anthonius de Lentibiaco, pr. priorat., convent. Charmeliarum, pro se et ab. mon. s. Aufredi, Anici. dio., 1/10/34

ep. August. nacionis Germanice, 19/5/32 (Petrus de Schaumberg) -amb. seren. princ. d. imp. rom. d. Petrus, ep. August., 2/3/36 prep. Aquebelle (Joh. Curiis) nom. proc. d. ep. August. in Sabaudia et eciam nomine proprio, 12/12/32

Gerardus, Naudini, pro cap. August. prov. Tarentasi., 22/5/39

nuncii ac promotores d. ep. August. (prov. Tarentasi.), 12/31

mag. Augustinus de Florencia pro o.A., 8/6/34

Symon Reizer, bac. in theo., prov. Almanie superioris, vic. gen. pro o., 23/1/34

generalis o., 22/5/33

Augustinus, penitenciarius pape, 28/11/32

Augustinus Auwer, proc. illustris princ. d. Nicolai, ducis Oppavi., 4/9/39

mag. Augustinus de Crammona, o. fr. A., 13/8/34

mag. Augustinus de Florencia, pro o. A., 18/6/34

Augustinus Hawer, can. Prag., 10/9/34

Augustinus de Insula, doc. in decr., 9/37

Augustinus de Insula, doc. decr., 9/38

Augustinus de Lagranas, Marci de Clauaxio, o. humil. Yporrigi., dio., prep., 3/39

fr. Augustinus de Monte, prov. Marchie, 9/4/34

mag. Augustinus de Padua, o. A., pro o. 14/1/34

Michael Balduini, in art. mag. et in sac. pag. bac., Paris., lic. in leg., pro u. studii generalis Avinion, et nomine proprio, 19/9/32

Bernardus Boxados, o.P., pro u. Avinion., 19/9/32

ab. s. Andree, Avinion., 24/12/34

ab. Conch, Ruth., dio., 9/1/32
-nom. ab. Aureliac., o.s.B., Utic. dio., peciit unum monachum, bac. in decr., substituendum per ipsum d. ab. Conch. eius proc., 13/5/33, substitutus inc. 22/5/33

Petrus de Trillia, decr. doc., ardiac. Lodovensem, 6/8/32
-proc. d. elect. Autissoder., 15/12/32

ep. Autissioder., amb. ducis Burgund., 2/10/33 (Laurentius Pignon, o.P.)

arep. Auxitan., 6/1/34 (Philippus de Levis)

proc. Azolinus, s. Morini. Papi. ab., 5/37

d. Novari. in personam sui servitoris, B. de Porta, 6/4/33

Joh. Dieulfist, proc. cap. Baioc., 11/7/32

card. Placentina, pro et nom. d. ep. Baioc. sui nepotis, 21/11/32 (Branda de Castillione)

mag. Thomas Hauhe, nom. cap. Baioc., 29/5/33

vic. Maguntin., pro et nom. electi Baioc., 6/10/33

mag. Balduinus Cutiferi, in decr. bac., can. August., 22/5/39

ab. de Balerna, 13/11/33

Baltasar in Creuna, Brandenburg. ab., 6/37

proc. Baltasar, ab. in Walspurg, August. dio., 7/38

Balthasar, ab. in Czenna, o. Cist., Brandeburg., 27/4/36

fr. Balthasar de Monsinghein, lector conventus Friburgi inferioris, Constanc. dio., o.M., 28/7/41

Balthasar de la Sale, 31/7/33

Anth. de Parma, pro et nom. habitatorum civitatum Bambergensium, 30/8/32

Nic. de Indagine, lic. in utr. iuris, proc. cap. Bamberg., 1/4/32
-nom. d. ep. Bamberg., 4/2/33

Georgius de Sweinberg, cant. et can. Bamberg., pro cap. Bamberg., 16/1/34

Joh. de Thenen, decr. doc., pro ep. Bamberg., 27/6/32

ep. Bamberg., 16/1/34 (Antonius de Rotenhan)

mag. Wernerus Aufses, pro ep. Bamberg., 6/7/36

d. Baptista de Primiceriis, bac. in decr., pro ab. s. Justini de Slusia, o.s.B., 15/5/33 proc. Barchinon., ep, 4/37

Simon Salvatoris, Barchinon. ep., 8/37

fr. Barduiniis Sansonis, o. Carm., mag. in theo., 14/5/35

mag. Bartholdus Fuster, abbr. litt. apost., can. Norwic., 23/12/35

Bartholdus Hultinghen, pro ab. de Weystech, 18/9/33

mag. Bartholdus Humberk, 17/10/33

Bartholomeus Alkerii, 29/4/35

ab. s. Bartholomei de Azano, Ast. dio., 4/11/33

fr. Barth. de Bolea, pr. Montissorn., nom. proc. d. Petri Joh., ardiac. Belchic. in eccl. Cesaraugustan., 2/11/39

fr. Barth. Conradi, prep. de Carlinga, o.s.B., Trever. dio., 17/11/41

Lazarus Lipora, pro ab. s. Bartholomei de Fossato, o. Vallisumbrose, Janu. dio., 25/9/33

mag. Barth. de Fraxino, pro cap. Edu., 30/5/32

Barth. de Hagis, mag. in art. et med., 23/7/34

Barth. Hellen de Hamont, mag. in art., 24/4/33

Barth de Junckdella, can. et sacrista eccl. de Guisona, Urgell. dio., 27/6/39
-proc. d. Manuelis Navarro, in leg. lic., rect. eccl. parr. de Ternyons dio. Valentin., 16/10/39

Barth. Libenvalt, can. Warmi., 1/7/40

Barth. de Mulbruno, lic. in theo., socius ab. de Mulbruno, 26/3/32

Barth. de Paterno, s. Thom. Laud., prep., 4/37

Barth. de Pileo, 18/11/34

Barth. Poignare, can. Atrebat., 19/10/36

Barth. de Ponte, in decr. bac., dec. et can. Segrobric., presb., 15/5/39

Barth. de Provanis, decr. doc., precept. s. Ant. de Clivassio, Yporrigi. dio., 23/10/39

Barth. Rigaudi, pr. s. Yonis, Paris. dio., o. Clun., 5/7/32

Barth. Roscelli, lic. in utr., pro d. Biterre, 14/1/34

Barth. Tagati, rect. eccl. parr. de Ystero, Aqu. dio., 23/7/40

mag. Barth. notarius concilii et capel. d. Firmani, 16/5/32

personaliter Bartolomeus de Zambechariis, Bononie ab., 12/37

prep. s. Leonardi Basili., 16/1/33

scol. Basil., postea dec. eccl. cath., 29/2/32

pr. Basil., de Cart. o., 11/12/31

d. prep. Thuric., 11/12/31 (Henricus Anasteter)
-nom. ep. Basil., 23/7/35

mag. domus s. Joh. Jher., Basil., 18/1/33

mag. fabrice eccl. Basil., 22/5/39

Joh. Ghelz, Anglicus, bac. in leg., can. in Lubic., proc. d. Bathon., Lingorn, et Wingorni., 8/3/32

precursores d. Wylhelmi, ducis Bavarie, 1/32

mag. Lud. Scaec, pro et nom. dd. abb. s. Petri et s. Bavonis Gandesium, lic. in decr., 23/5/32 (constituit procuratores suos, 5/7/32)

ab. Bellelagie, o.Premonst., 29/2/32
-30/7/34

ep. Bellic., amb. ducis Sabaud., 17/3/32 (Guilielmus Didier)

Percevallis, ep. Bellic., 16/10/39 (Percevallis de Balma)

Nicolaus de Sola, decr. doc. off. Abrinc., pro ep. et cap. Abrinc., licet pro abb. s. Michaelis et de Bellobecho, 4/5/32

fr. Benedictus de Ispania, o.M., Oliveti, 23/2/33

Benedictus, ab. mon. s. Laurencii extra muros Tridentin., o.s.B., 8/1/40

Odo, prothonotarius pro arep. Beneventan., 4/2/35

Berengarius de Cusano, Eln., proc. autem N. s. Grenati et Gervasii, Claromont., 10/37

Berengarius Focrandi, pr. priorat. convent. b. Marie s. Olive, o.s.B., Barchinon. dio., 15/5/39

fr. Berengarius Masaudi, bac. camerarius mon. s. Salvatoris, civitatis Lodov., pro d. ab. eiusdem mon., 9/3/36

off. Edu., 12/12/31
-proc. Berengarius Petra, 7/7/32

Berengarius, ep. Petragoric., nacionis Gallican., 1/32

Berengarius, de Populeto, in decr. bac., beneficiat. in eccl., Valentin., 23/4/40

Bern. Boxados, o.P., pro u. Avinion., 19/9/32

Bern. Boessonis, lic. in leg., dec. eccl. s. Michaelis Castri Novi, s. Papuli dio., 7/5/34

Bern. de Bosco, decr. doc., 12/38

Bern. de Bosco, vic. Ilerd., pro d. Antonio ab. mon. s. Petri de Bisuldino, o.s.B., Gerund. dio., 22/5/39

fr. Bern. Catalani, decr. doc., o. Captivorum, 27/6/39

fr. Bernardus Chevenerii, o. Clun., bac. form. in theo., 11/8/32

fr. Bernardus de Cortesio, pr. priorat. s. Theodori, o.s.A., Magalon. dio., 29/10/39

Bern. Darslay de Sitzaloen, ardiac. in eccl. coll. Sendomeri., presb., mag. in art. et can. Primisli., 14/10/35

Bern. Dyonisii, 1/12/36

Bern. de Flepepeyo, elect. confirmatus Poperati, s. Flori, dio. N., 9/37

Joh. Slizenroid, promotor sacri concilii, nom. proc. d. Bern. de Galen, in art. mag. et in sac. pag. lic., can. Leodi. et rect. parr. eccl. in Yselmuden, Traject. dio., 23/6/41

fr. Bern. d. Galoti de Petragabi, 3/9/34

Bern. Galterandi, bac. in decr., presb. commensalis et parr. eccl. Terracon., 10/7/39

Bern. Guillermi, 9/2/33

Bern. Hoppener, dec. eccl. coll. ss. Joh. et Dyonysii, Hervord., Padeburn. dio., 29/5/39

Bern. de Loyn, presb. cur. parr. eccl. de Meghen et can. in Bosco Ducis (Herzogenbusch), 14/5/34

Bern. Quiriti, in utr. bac., 11/38

Bern. de Roccaforti, in decr. lic., 8/37

fr. Bern., pr. mon. can. reg., Sagatensi., Vratislavi. dio., 21/5/34

Bern. Sassensis, decr. doc., arpresb., 20/11/33

Bern. Sconez, in utr. bac., 8/37

Bern. de Spina, 20/11/33

Bern. Sprich, pro electo et convent. Montis Monachorum, Bamberg., 22/8/32

Bern de Stena, bac. in decr., can. eccl. cath. Nemau. et. rect. de Salis, Albi. dio., 26/11/34

Bern. Tholosa, can. et sacrista minor eccl. Vic., decr. doc., 5/6/39

Bern Vicencii, o.P., mag. in theo., amb. d. Ferdinandi, filii illustrissimi d. regis Arragonum, 17/2/41

fr. Bernhardus Michaelis, sacrista mon. s. Michaelis de Cussiano, o.s.B., Eln. dio., proc. ab. dicti mon., 29/4/40

Fridericus de Reno et Bernhardus de Roczechusen, coelecti Basili., 1/37

fr. Bertetus de Manso, monachus mon. Chassanie, o. Cist., 9/10/39

Bertoldus Bokenoue, lic. in decr., pro ep. et cap. Minden., 17/4/34

Bertoldus Brisacher, pleb. in Mellico, Patavi. dio., de familia d. Patavi., 17/2/41

Bertoldus Herwici, rect. parr. eccl. de Rende, Maguntin. dio., 8/7/40

Bertoldus de Medelhem, decr. doc., 1-6/43

Bertoldus Sitenbeck, o.A., in theo. lect., 3/38

Bertonus de Vassello, prep. Vertagionis, 19/6/33

Bertrandus de Burro, in decr. lic., 10/38

Bertrandus Doladilha, fr., adm. est pro et nom. ab. Case Dei, Claromont., 20/5/33
-pro se, 22/5/33

Bertrandus de Mansione, lic. in decr., elect. in ab. mon. Rivopulli, Vic. dio., o.s.B., 11/3/40

fr. Bertrandus de Mediolano, pr. s. Martini de Gazo, 1/38

Bertrandus Millen, in leg. lic., 12/11/34

Bertrandus de Monte Murato, o.s.B., 27/10/36

fr. Bertrandus Rechal Filo, in decr. lic., 8/37

ab. mon. s. Joh. Baptiste in Betania, 12/6/33

fr. Bisuncius Madurelli, pr. priorat. de Bevay, o. Clun., Lausan. dio., 6/2/40

Egidius Grusneti, lic. in theo., can. Bisuntin., pro cap. Bisuntin., 18/7/32

ardiac. Bisuntin., 17/4/33

Bartholomeus Roscelli, lic. in utr., pro d. Biterri., 14/1/34

Jacobus de Campis, can. Turon., pro cap. Bituric., 5/9/33

Joh. de Ronuceyo, mag. in theo., can. Biturric., pro cap. Bituric. et ep. Anici., 4/11/33

ab. s. Blasii, Constanci. dio., o.s.B., 4/5/32

ab. Bone Vallis, o.s.B., Carnot. dio., 28/7/36

ab. Bone Vallis, Ruthen. dio., 16/5/32
-incorp. et adm. est pro parte ep. Cavallic., 16/5/32
-pro Francie, 15/7/32

Guillermus de Auris, cleric. Ruthen. dio., pro ab. Bonecumbe, o. Cist., 18/3/35

d. ab. eius (Berengarius, ep. Petragoric.) nepos, Bonecumbe, o. Cist., 26/2/32

Symon de Valle, auditor card. Bononi., 16/5/32
-proc. ep. Bononi., 5/9/32

Bonsuper, ab. s. Thoffredi, Anici. dio., 20/11/33

mag. Boucherius de Haya, mag. in art. et bac. in leg., rect. parr. eccl. de Plumeloch, Maclovi., dio., 16/4/34

ep. Bousanus, 6/7/36 (Julianus de Tallada, o.P.)

Joh. de Sagobia, in sac. pag. doc., pro Fernando, arep. Brachar., 7/8/36

proc. arep. Brachar., 2/37

duo magistri missi per dd. arep. Magdeburg., ep. Merseburg. et ep. Brandenburg, et u. studii Erphord., 8/2/32

Joh., can. eccl. Brandenburg., proc. ep. Brandenburg., 14/3/32

Brandenburg. ep., 1/38 (Stephan. Bodeker)

Theodericus de Geysen, pro se et arep. Bremens., 25/5/36

nuncius sive proc. arep. Bremens., 3/2/32

Nich. Surach, dec. Brixin. nom. suo proprio; et debent deliberare d. de communibus, si pro d. Brixin. ep. veniat admittendus, 9/9/32
-adm. pro d. Brixin., 11/12/32

Franciscus, ep. Brixin., 22/5/33 (Franciscus de Marerio)

Brocardus, ab. s. Walburgis, dio Argentin., 26/1/33

ab. de Brouet, Coloni. dio., 25/8/36

Burckardus Burckardi de Diesten, rect. medie porcionis in eccl. s. Reynoldi Tremoni., Coloni. dio., 18/3/40

Alf. Garcie, leg. doc., proc. d. arep. Compostellan. et d. ep. Burg. et ep. Oxom., 11/10/34

Joh. Didaci, decr. doc., ab. de Cernatos, proc. d. ep. Burg., 22/10/34

Gobellinus, ep. Burglan., 7/5/32 (Gobelinus Bolant, o. er. s. A.)

mag. Robertus au Clou, proc. d. ducis Burgundie, 4/4/34

mag. Joh. Lauantaige, prep. Insul. et tamquam amb. d. ducis Burgundie, 14/1/35

Hugo de Ordeo, Cabilon. ep., arep. Rothomag. elect., 12/4/32 (hugo d'Orgis)

arep. de Merutana Cabilon. dio., pro ab. s. Cornelii et pro ipso, 3/6/35 (Joannes Rolinus)

Calcerandus Carden, s. Salvatoris de Brea, Gerund. ab., 12/38

Caldadinus de Pisso, utr. iur. doc., 19/10/36

Petrus de Ponte, capel. Camerac., can. s. Gauerici, pro cap. Camerac., 8/5/32

proc. N. ab. s. Sepulchri, Camerac., 8/37

proc. ep. Camerac., 17/4/33

proc. N. Camerac. ep. et Eln. ep., 6/37

prep. Camin., 7/8/33
-inc. 17/10/33

Colomanus, decr. doc., proc. can. reg., dio. Salzeburg., 30/1/33

fr. Guillermus, prep. mon. in Thingen, pro prelatis can. reg. Constanci. dio., 23/1/34

Gaspar Emenouise, pro certis mon. can. reg., pro dio. Salzeburg., 20/5/35

mag. Joh. Riberselli, can. Capnone, pro cap. 16/1/34

ep. Capruli., 15/5/33 (Andreas de Monticuto)

Ymbertus de Chissiaco, lic. in leg., precentor Biterr., 5/5/33
-proc. loco d. ep. Carcason., 5/6/33

pr. de Caritate, o. Clun., 12/9/32

gen. Carm., 22/3/32

proc. gen. o. Carm., 22/5/33

ab. s. Petri in Valle Carnot., 21/5/34

Petrus Remigii, scol. Toletan., proc. d. arep. Toletan. et d. ep. Cartagen., 22/10/34

quidam religio Carth., 7/6/32

Guillermus Militis, pr. s. Neterii, lic. in decr., pro ab. Case Dei, 21/8/34

Anth. Mistralis, bac. in decr., pr. priorat. Grandissonis, Lausan. dio., pro et nom. ipsius adm. est pro ab. Case Dei, dio. Claromont., 20/5/33

Robertus de Poers, dec. Limric. et ardiac. Lismor., pro arep. Cassell. et eius suffrageneis de Ybernia et nom. privato, 24/4/34

mag. Radulphus de Porta, 10/10/32
-adm. pro et nom. ep. Castr., 17/6/33

mag. Jacobus de Attigniaco, utr. iur. doc., can. Rem., nom. suo proprio et cap. Rem. et Cathalaun., 24/4/33

ab. Bone Vallis, Ruth. dio., inc. et adm. pro parte ep. Cavallic., 16/5/32

ep. Cavallic., 19/9/32 (Ferrerius Gailbert)

mag. Martinus le Burruger, pro ep. Cenoman., 9/1/33

fr. J., o.s.B., pro ab. Cernac., dio Cracovi. in Polonia, 14/1/34

ab. de Cerreto, o. Cist., 11/4/32

ep. Chi., 15/5/33 (Leonardus de Palavicino)

Christianus in Bersperch, Frinsing. dio., o.s.B., 24/10/32

Christianus de Hempel, off. Colon., amb. arep. Maguntin., 1912/32

Christianus Vernisi, dec. de Graueyo, 3/6/35

mag. Chrisophorus de Broyis, literarum hujus sacri concilii scriptor notarius, nacionis Italice, 23/10/39

Christophorus Deuspisana, can. eccl. Moseli., mag. in art., 16/1/34

card. Cippri, 30/3/34

Ciriacus Leckstein, vic. eccl. s. Petri Fritzlari., 19/7/43

ep. Civitatis Novi, 15/5/33 (Marcus)

Joh. de Ravenitis, proc. ab. Clarevallis, Mediolan. dio., o. Cist., 7/9/33

ab. Clarevallis, Lingoni. dio., 13/11/33

ab. Case Dei, Claromontan., 10/9/32

Bertrandus Doladilha, adm. est pro et nom. abb. Claramont., 20/5/33

Symon Pinguisdepane, in sac. pag. prof., pro ep. Claromont., 12/6/34

proc. N. ss. Grenati et Gervasii, Claroment. dio. abb., 10/37

Claudius Boyssonis, cur. eccl. s. Desiderii Cormarentie, Lugdun. dio., 15/1/40

Claudius Gerbasii, can. Maurian., 9/12/40

mag. Claudus Buimale, can. Lugdun., 5/5/33

Clemens Nicolai, Lublin. in Cracovi., ardiac., 3-5/42

ab. de Clivate, Mediolan. dio., 4/11/33

quidam pr. o. Clun., pro et nom. d. ab. Cluniac., 27/2/32

elemosinarius pro ab. et o. Cluniac., 2/5/33

Colomanus, decr. doc., proc. can. reg., dio. Salzeburg., 30/1/33

Helbicus de Bopardia, dec. Wesali., nuncio arep. Coloni., et arep. Maguntin., 28/2/32

mag. Nycolaus de Cusa, dec. de Confluenc., nuncio arep. Colon. et Magunt., doc. decr., 29/2/32

Henrricus Herpil, prep. Severini Coloni., pro d. arep. Colon., 22/8/32 off. Coloni., proc. arep. Coloni., 24/10/32

off. Coloni., proc. arep. Coloni., 12/12/32

ab. de Columbas, Ytalice nacionis, 5/4/32

Symon Coigni, pr. de Medunta, Carnot. dio., pro ab. de Columbus, 21/8/34

ab. s. Cornelii, Compendi., Suession. dio., 23/2/32

fr. Joh. ab. de Lerez, proc. arep. et aliquorum prelatorum prov. Compostellan., 22/10/34

Alf. Garcie, leg. doc., proc. d. arep. Compostellan. et d. ep. Burg. et ep. Oxom., 22/10/34

ab. Conch., Ruth. dio., 9/1/32
-nom. ab. Aureliaci, o.s.B., Utic. dio., peciit unum monachum, bac. in decr. substitutendum per ipsum dominum ab. Conch. eius proc., 13/5/33

ep. Conch., Yspania, 14/11/32 (Alvarus Nunnez de Isorna)

Conmanus, prep. mon. Omnium Sanctorum, o. Premon., dio Argentin., 26/11/35

Thom. Rode, nom. proc. d. Conradi, electi Argentin., 23/1/40

Con. Axtiismuller, rect. parr. eccl. in Lansperg, August. dio., capel. d. Alberti ducis Bavarie et comitis palantini Reni, 20/5/40

Con. Campstein, rect. parr. eccl. in Langen, Maguntin. dio., nom. proc. Dietherii de Ysemburg, scol. Coloni., 7/4/40

Con. Freilly, can. Trident. presb., 17/6/40

fr. Con. Grutsch, bac. in theo., lector conv. Turic., o.M., 27/10/41

Con de Horwa, presb. prebend. in eccl. coll. Columberi., Basili. dio., cui beneficio cura imminet animarum, 23/11/41

Con. Mursawe, mag. in art., cant. eccl. Vird., Constanci. dio., 22/5/39

Con. Pucherel, rect. parr. eccl. in Fonte Superiori, Argentin. dio., mag. in art., 8/7/40

Con. Regelforder, prep. eccl. s. Marie in Ror, o.s.A. can. reg., Ratispon. dio., 8/1/40

Con., ep. Ratispon., cum quibusdam dd. sue dio., 13/12/31

Con. Siber, s. Tiburcii, Ratispon. prep., 3-5/42

Con. Smaez, can. Frinsing., 7/7/41

Con. Werstat, o.P., domus Maguntin. lector in sac. pag., 17/11/41

Con. Wolf, Wratislavi. et Olomuc. eccl. can., rect. s. Joh. in Bockenberg, bac. in decr., 19/7/43

Conr. Beken, mag. in art., 28/9/36

Conr. Lemelgher, bac. in iur. can., 1/10/34

Conr. Lulli, doc. decr., pro et nom. cleri, Constanci., 29/7/32

Conr. Mathie, can. eccl., ss. Martini et Severi, Trever. dio., 5/12/32

mag. Conr. Possinger, lic. in decr., 28/9/36

Conr. Prost de Beinsem, can. eccl. s. Victor. Maguntin., 24/3/33

Conr. Schenck, lic. in decr., can. Eistet., 23/7/34

mag. Conr. Welin, sac. theo. professor, can. s. Joh. Herbipol., 12/11/35

Conr., ab. in Cheel, o.s.B., Frinsing., 23/1/33

Conr. Goudeffri, preceptor in Suchl, o.s. Joh. Jher., 5/6/33

Conr. Schmat, dio. Argentin., 7/11/32

Conr. Semach, capel. d. Firmani, 29/11/32

mag. Conr. de Westislavia, 26/1/33

mag. Joh. Quelden, proc. cleri Constanci., allegans collegam suum breviter venturum cum sufficiento mandato, 13/6/32

Conr. Lulli, doc. decr. et nom. cleri Constanci., 29/7/32

Georgius, pro ep. Constanci., 23/7/35

d. prep. Thuric. nom. d. ep. Constanci., prov. Maguntin., 11/12/31 (Henricus Anastetter)

Thom. Francisci pro cap. Constanci., prov. Rothomag., 21/8/33

Philibertus, ep. Constanci., Rothomag. prov., 11/9/31 (Philibertus de Montejou)

can. s. Stephani, Constanci., 31/10/32

Joh. Rouselli, pro ab. de Corbeya, 4/7/32

ep. Corent., 23/9/41 (This see is not mentioned in Gams or Eubel.)

arep. Corff., 22/5/33 (Martinus Bernardini, o. can. s.A.)

Cormacus, ab. mon. s. Jacobi Scotorum, Ratispon. dio., 16/4/34

ep. Cramon., pro arep. Janu., 25/4/32 (Venturinus Marnii)

Petrus de Trillia, decr. doc., ardiac. Lodovensem, 6/8/32
-inc. pro abb. Fontis Frigidi, o. Cist., et Crass., o.s.B., s. Illari de s. Ilario, Carcasson. dio., 18/9/33

Galeacius de Caprinis, decr. doc., pro ep. Cremon., 29/5/34

proc. ab. s. Laurenci Cremon., 4/5/32

arep. Cret., 12/2/34 (Fantinus Vallaressius)

d. Cristianus Regine, mag. in theo., prep. eccl. in Brumea et can. Ulmac., 10/4/39

Cristoforus Benedicti, in utr. bac., 10/38

Cristoforus de Lugano, in leg. lic., 2/38

ep. Croy., 2/4/34 (Antonius Venturae, o.s.Fr.)

ab. s. Marie de Cubino, o. Cisterc., 18.9/33

Marcus de Maronibus, decr. doc., pro clero dio. Cuman., 2/4/33

Pascasius de Rivola, o. Hum. pro clero Cuman., 17/9/34

ep. Cuman., nacionis Ytalice, 23/2/32 (Franciscus de Bassis)

ab. s. Abundi extra muros Cuman., 26/7/32 ep. Curion., o. Pruten., 16/1/33 (Joannes Tirgarth, o. Teut.)

Henricus Attender, can. s. Andree, Coloni., pro ep. Curi., 16/1/34

Joh. Kempener, pro officio cursoris, 15/10/34

Ulricus Auussiensis, amb. rex Dacie, 15/3/34

pr. Damnergui, Gebenn. dio., 15/3/34

mag. Dancardus Rennbolt, in art. et med. mag., Camerac. dio., 1/7/40

fr. Daniel de Paniceriis, o.P., in theo. mag., 21/6/40

David Kadiee, precentor eccl. Glasgu., 8/2/34

mag. David Petit, bac. in decr., can. Noch., 3/12/34

Degenhardus Salingher, dec. Ratispon., 8/38

Deodatus de Avenco, pr. de Rupegelu, Ruthen. dio., 4/3/40

Deodatus Costini, bac. in decr., pr. de Gondimonte, dio. Ruthen., 13/11/33

Deodatus Gassini, bac. in decr., 27/10/36

Derslaud Nicolai de Royzinowe, decr. doc., ardiac. et can. Cracovi., 2/5/39

Otto, Dertus. ep., 6/38 (Otto de Moncada)

ab. s. Michaelis Dyadi., 15/5/33

Didacus Alvari, in decr. lic., 8/38

Didacus Niger, 9/2/33

mag. Jacobus Alberti, can. Ebredun., nom. cap. Ebredun., cap. Valentin., et cap. Dien., 12/9/32

Con. Campestein, rect. parr. eccl. in Langen, Maguntin. dio., nom. proc. Dietherii de Ysemburg, scol. Coloni., 7/4/40

Dyo., guardianus convent. minorum Paris., formatus, 11/37

Dyo. Anquin, capel. in eccl. Paris. presb., 28/4/32

Dyo. Aptensmuler, in decr. lic., 3/39

Dyo. de Buxo, ordinarius eccl. Mediolan., 4/37

Dyo. Cathalanensis, 26/2/32

Dyo. Creich, 18/9/33

Dyo. de Gluciano de Mediolano, decr. doc. et in leg. lic., 12/10/36

Dyo. Grieten, proc. Ludo. Scaec, 6/7/32

Dyo. Mabire, in art. mag., 23/1/34

mag. Dyo. Mathildis, custos Nomani, 13/8/34

Dyo. de Rivealbo, pr. priorat. convent. b. Marie de Cassiano, Lucen. dio., 1/6/36

Dyo. de Sabenrays, in sac. theo. mag., amb. univ. Paris., 12/4/31

Dietleuus Hoier, can. cath. eccl. Coloni. et vic. parr. eccl. opidi Lenstat, Lubic. dio., 3/11/36

pr. s. Benigni Divion., mag. in theo., pro ab. eiusdem mon., 30/5/32

u. studii de Dola in Burgundia, 1-2/39

Dom., tituli ss. Iohannis et Pauli s. Romane eccl. card., Tarracon. vulgariter nuncupatus., 7/38

Dom., ab. s. Benedict. Versell. dio., 25/6/39

Dom. de Brido, 4/5/36

Dom. Firmanus, card., 15/4/32 (Capranica)

fr. Dom. de Laschampa de Rondanario extra muros Cumanos, o. Humil., prep., 4/37

Dom. de Rahor, cur. loci Bisuntin. dio., 10/6/40

Dom. Raimundsu, proc. dd. . . ., 25/8/41

Dom. Romehow, bac. in decr., presb. rect. parr. eccl. loci Bethy, Cesaraugustan. dio., 15/5/39

Dom. de Sancto, Laurencio, can. Creten., 30/4/34

Dom. de Tantonvilla, rect. eccl. parr. de Castineto, Tull. dio., 8/1/40

ab. mon. Dompnimartini, o. Premon., 5/12/32

socius ab. pro o. et cap. generali mon. Dompnimartini, o. Premon., 5/12/32

Petrus et Donaldum Machuacen, dec. eccl. Dunkeld., decr. doctores, 8/2/34

Donatus de Mediolano, mag. in theo., o.M., 12/10/36

Donghanus de Lychton, dec. eccl. Abbedon., 5/3/34

Doringocius de Melssio, can. Aquilegi., pro cap., 2/4/34

ab. Dove, Anici. dio., 2/4/33

Joh. Eldach, bac. in utr., proc. d. arep. Dublin., ep. Moed., 20/11/33

Ebemondus Peroneti, leg. doc., 12/38

ab. Ebrac., o. Cist., 17/5/32

Joh. Paulani, professus mon. Ebrac., bac. in theo., pro d. ab. eiusdem mon., 23/3/36

Ebrardus, ab. mon. in Roeyffestessus, 7/11/32

ep. Ebroic., 3/7/33 (Martialis Formerii)

mag. Jacobus Alberti, can. Ebredun., nom. cap. Ebredun., cap. Valentin., et cap. Dien., 12/9/32

Jacobus Macellarii, can. pro cap. Ebredun., 22/5/33

Jacobus Brus, pro ab. mon. s. Crucis de Edinwourg, o.s.A., s. Andree dio., 18/3/35

Edmundus, clericus eccl. Anic., 9/2/33

off. Edu. nom. ep. et cleri, 20/6/32

mag. Bart. de Fraxino, pro cap. Edu., 30/5/32

mag. Petrus de Tintavilla, pro d. ep. Edu. adm. per dd. deputatos de xii, bac. in decr., ardiac. Edu., 26/8/35

Egecius Egliger, s. Andree, Frising. prep., 3/38

Egidius de Argentolis, can. Lingon., pro cap. Lingon., 3/2/33

fr. Egidius Ballivi, pr. mon. Interlac., o.s.A., Lausan. dio., 1/12/41

fr. Egidius Bocheroul, o. can. reg., pro toto cap. generali Wydesemensi, Traiect. dio., 31/8/32

Egidius Canineti, in art. et med. mag., amb. u. Paris., -pro et nom. ep. Noviom., 14/3/32

mag. Egidius Carlerius, mag. in sac. pag., proc. et nom. proc. ep. Attrebat., dec. Camerac., o.P., 3/2/32

Egidius Clarent, mag. in art., Paris., et can. Camerac., 24/12/34

Egidius Ernsloss, rect. eccl. parr. in Tornach., Basil. dio., capel. d. Joh. comitis de Dierstein, 8/1/40

Egidius Gruseneti, lic. in theo., can. Bisuntin., pro cap. Bisuntin., 18/7/32

Egidius Guerici, cursor familiaris d. Arelat., 4/3/35

Egidius de Laire, pro pr. de Montibus in Hanonia, 10/9/34

Egidius Ogerii, can. Rem., pro se et ab. s. Thiberii, Agath. dio., 24/4/34

Egidius Ogerii, pro ep. Vabr., 25/8/36

Egidius, Roz. ep., o. Carm., de nacione Germanie, 13/2/32

Egidius Zacarlie, 2/5/33

Joh. de Eych, can. Eistet., pro cap. Eistet., 6/7/36

proc. ep. Eystet., 16/5/32

ep. Eistet., 15/2/34 (Albertus de Hohenrechberg)

dec. Eystet., 7/1/33

proc. N. Camerac. ep. et ep. Eln., 6/37

Ant. Arilarum, Eln. ep., 9/37

proc. N. s. Martini de Canigone, Eln. dio., ab., 6/37

proc. ab. s. Martini de Carnigagia, Eln., 3/39

fr. Joh. Wypennim, o.A., bac. form. in theo., proc. d. ep. Elph., 20/11/33

Emanuel Ouade, can. et vestiarius eccl. cath. Nemau., 26/11/34

Joh. Gruenwalt, mag. in art., can. Embric. dio., Traiect., proc. et nom. proc. eiusdem eccl., 4/9/32

Joh. Didaci, ab. de Cervatos, proc.ab. s. Emiliani, 14/5/35

mag. Eneas Gondemari, in art. mag., rect. parr. eccl. de Laudela, Leon. dio., 27/5/40

Engelardus Suchenreif, capel. eccl. s. Marie in Emberg, Ratispon. dio., capel. d. Joh. ducis Bavarie, 12/11/40

mag. Erardus de Tainteville, lic. in leg., 14/8/33

Erasmus Sternhals, rect. eccl. parr. in Durincstat, Herbipol. dio., 29/1/40

mag. Ernestu Broydinbach, rect. eccl. parr. Magnomunre, Maguntin. dio., abbr. litt. sac. concilii., 29/1/40

Erhardus Appenwiler, rect. eccl. parr. in Slierbach, Basili. dio., capel. eccl. Basili., 5/6/39

duo magistri missi per dd. arep. Magdeburg., ep. Merseburg. et ep. Brandeburg. et u. studii Erphord., 8/2/32

mag. Thilmanus Grisler, pro studio Erphord., 20/11/33

Joh. de Francfordia, mag. in art., pro u. Erford., 23/12/35

Joh. Gherowini, pro dd. Erico et Bernardo, ducibus Saxonie, 21/5/34

ab. Eschoph, 19/3/34

Essiminus Garsie de Villanova, nobilis ex utr. parente beneficiatus in eccl. ville de Epula in villa de Rikle, Cesaraugustan. dio., 22/4/40

Eurardus, dec. Novemecclesiarum, o. can. reg., dio. Bamberg., 16/1/34

Eusebius, major can. eccl. s. Marie Versell., 7/9/39

Eustacius Franieri, bac. in utr., adm. in proc. nom. d. ep. Trec., 10/9/33

Pascasius de Pino, o.M., confessor, familiaris, proc. card. s. Eustacii, 21/6/32

card. s. Eustacii, 10/2/33 (Jacobus de Insulanis)

quinque familiares d. s. Eustacii fuerint concilio inc., 10/2/33

Eustacius, proc. ep. Trec., 10/9/33

Fauqueti, can. Autisiodor., 12/11/40

Felix Hamelin, decr. doct., can. Thuric., pro parte cleri Constanci. (Conr. Luli claims proctorship.) FH seeks admission 29/7/32, adm. 30/8/32. CL adm. as proc. 29/7/32.

Ferdinand. Sellieles, lic. in decr., dio. Cesaraugustan. et beneficiatus in eadem eccl., 16/10/39

Fernandus Alfonsi, presb., 22/10/34

Fernandus Alfonsi, de Palentuela, presb., 22/10/34

Rodericus Gundissalui de Gomeldsen, pr. secularis eccl. b. Marie de Roa pro Fernando Gundisslaui, rect. dicte ville de Gomes, 29/10/34

Fernandus, ab. s. Leonardi, o. Premonstrat., Salamantin. dio., 10/9/34

ep. Ferrari., 30/6/33 (Joannes de Tossignano)

ab. Filliaci, o.s.A., Gebenn. dio., amb. ducis Sabaudia, 7/2/32

Aeneas Picolomini de Senis, familiaris card. Firmani, proc. card. Firmanus, 9/8/32

Florianus de Drosdan, Tridentin. dio., arpresb., 9-10/42

fr. Nicolaus, pr. mon. Fontis Salutis, o. Cist., dio. Eistet., proc. eiusdem mon., bac. form. in theo., 20/11/33

Formondus Wulchardi, lic. in decr. et bac. in iure civili, 23/7/40

vic. ep. Forron., 8/2/34
ab. Fortunati, Vicentin., 15/3/34

provincialis Francie, o.P., 5/5/33

Franciscus, ab. s. Marie de Carceribus, 15/3/34

Franc. de Alvorotis, leg. doc., 30/4/34

Franc. Angeli, 17/4/33

Franc. de Annadiis, Vituli, Placentin., prep., 4/37

Franc. Artaudi, prep. Tricastrin., 27/10/36

Franc. de Bossis, utr. iur. doc., Mediolan., 18/8/32

Franc. Columbi, bac. in art., can Barchin. et acolitus s. d. nostri pape, 1/12/36

Franc. Columbi et Joh. Rikossen, pro scol. Spir., 1/12/36

Franc. Crey, can. eccl. cath., Meton. et pleb. s. Panthaleon., dio. Castellan., 16/4/34

Franc. de la Cruce, decr. doc., primicerius eccl. Mediolan., ex parte illustrissimi principis d. Philippi Marie, ducis Mediolan., abbr. apost. litt., 28/1/32
-advocatus d. arep. Magdeburg, 30/1/33

Franc. de Lasala, in utr. bac., 12/38

Franc. Luppi, dec. in Fribourc. (Freiburg i. Br.) pro et nom. ab. et convent. mon. s. Ruperti, Constanc. dio., prov. Maguntin., 28/4/32
-Alexius Stecle, presb. rect. parr. eccl. in Wethouun, proc. Franc. Luppi, mon. s. Rupert, 28/4/32

Franc. de Pistorio, arpres. Quiri., decr. doc. Taurin. dio., pro ab. s. Justi de Secusia, 2/10/33
-pro d. ep. Taurin., 20/7/36

Franc. de Reynay, bac. in decr., Gebenn. dio., cleric., 4/3/40

Franc. Rodi, 19/11/34

Franc. de Thomagiss, Engelone prep., 7/37

Franc. de Torrente, beneficiatus in eccl. Dertus., camerarius d. card. Panormitan., 10/3/41

Franco Keuddeken, prep. s. Petri, Thoralt., Tornac. dio., 24/12/34

Fred., protonotarius arep. Maguntin., amb. arep. Maguntin., 10/12/31

Fred. Deghenart, cur. parve Basilee, 23/7/35

Fred. de Dudeldorff, in utr. iur. lic., 23/7/34

Fred. Greherii, 30/3/33

Fred. Linegrand, scol. eccl. s. Jacobi, Bamberg., 26/11/34

Fred. de Puhken, decr. doc., August. dio., 31/8/36

Fred. Redoys, prep. s. Fidis, Bamberg., 12/38

Fred. Sturmelin, can. et scol. eccl. s. Martini in Rinfeld, Basil. dio., cappel. perpetuus eccl. Basili., 3/10/39

Fred Werlin, bac. in theo., 23/1/34

Stephanus de Cassi de Novuria, leg. doc., 9/4/32
-proc. pr. s. Frediani de Luca, 31/8/33

mag. Fridericus Elebeck, cleric. Bremen., in art. mag., 20/5/40

Fridericus Hemerl, mag. in art. 15/7/40

Fridericus Hessel, can. eccl. coll. s. Cuniberti. Onolspac., rect. eccl. parr. in Lerpur, Herbipol. dio., bac. in art., 12/2/40

Fridericus, ab. mon. s. Panthaleonis, Lucan. dio., o. Cist., 25/6/40

ep. Frising., Nicodemus, nuncius Alberti ducis Austrie, (Nicodemus della Scala) 5/7/32

ep. Frising. constituit suum mag. Joh. Celi, doc. u. Wien. ad se representandum pro ipso, 26/1/33

vic. d. ep. Frizing., 1/32
-pro d. duco Willeamo, protectore concilii, 14/5/34

Nic. de Marolo, pro abb. s. Fructuosi, Janu. dio., 25/9/33

Fulco de Merula, 27/2/33

ab. de Fulvia, 10/7/35

pr. Furn., o. Premon., pro ab. et o., 6/6/32
-proc. prep. Loz, Morin. dio., 11/9/32

Furseus de Bruille, prep. eccl. Attrebat. in personam mag. Henrici de Biuria, 29/8/33

mag. Furseus de Bruile, prep. Attrebat., 4/6/34

Joh. de Fonte, vic. d. ep. Ambian., 6/3/32
-pro et nom. mandatum ab. s. Fusciani, 11/8/32

G. Padesze, 9/2/33

G. Roberti, 9/2/33

fr. Gabriel, o. Humil., 11/8/33

ep. Gadic., 19/9/32 (Joannis Gundisalvi)

Galeacius de Caprinis, decr. doc., pro ep. Cremon., can. Mantuan., 29/5/33

Galeacius de Mantuan., pro cap. Mantuan., 30/4/34

ab. s. Galli, Constanci. dio., 19/8/35

Galterus Cossel, ardiac. Beluac., lit. sac. concilii scriptor pro se ipso, 10/4/39

ab. s. Prudencii, pro ep. Galugurritan., 17/12/34

Gardinus de Palma, auditor, 30/3/34

fr. Garinus Grelonis, refectorarius mon. Conch., nobilis ex utr. parente, 30/7/40

Garinus Yuer, can. Virdun., cur. de Regiteste, Rem. dio., 1/12/35

Garonus, ab. s. Petri de Alexandria, o.s.B., 27/6/32

Garsias Castinelho, can. eccl. cath. Jacc. et rect. eccl. parr. de Villariva, 8/4/40

Garsias Martini de Vaamonde, ardiac. de Reyna, proc. d. ep. Legion., 22/10/34

Garsie Fernandi, can. eccl. Burg., 14/5/35

Garsirius Lodomei, pr. priorat. de Rivello, o.s.B., Tull. dio., 3/7/39

fr. Gaspar de Bonavilla, superior priorat. s. Petri de Abbatisvilla, 27/4/36

Gaspar de Eysted, vicedominus et can. prebend. in eccl. Camin., 8/4/40

Gaspar Emenouise, pro certis mon. can. reg., pro dio. Salzeburg., 20/5/35

Gaspar de Fruys, can. Constanci., decr. doc., 17/2/36

Gaspar de Novacella, dio. Brixin., 10/1/34

Gaspar Paulocii de Theramo, can. Aprutinus, pro ep. Tricari., 21/8/34

Gaspar de Perusio, 17/4/33

Gaspar Szenner de militari genere, bac. in decr., 27/4/36

fr. Gaudencius de Planis, form. in theo. bac., 10/38

Gauffridus Moysen, rect. parr. eccl. de Triolore, Corisopit. dio., tenorista capelle d. ducis Britanie, 27/5/40

Gauffridus Tehel, mag. in art., Parisi. cur. de Passa Ramato, Maclovi. dio., 23/12/35

Gaufridus Gaudeneti, presb. cap. d. card. Verambosis, 1/7/40

mag. Gaufridus Henrici, utr. iur. bac., rect. eccl. parr. de Lavanden, pr. priorat. secularis de Xanctis, Venet. dio., nobilis, 23/1/40

Gaufridus Lebel, lic. in leg., scol. eccl. Brioc., 4/3/40

Amedeus Monachi, cant. et can. eccl. Gebenn., nom. cap. Gebenn., 23/11/41

ep. Gebenn., 12/11/31 (Franciscus de Meez)

ab. s. Georgii supra Ligerim, Andegav. dio. lic. in decr., 12/11/34

Georgius, can. Brixi., 30/4/34

card. de Columpna, proc. card. s. Petri ad vincula, 19/11/34

Henrricus Hebelin, pro priore s. Georgii, o. can. reg., 4/5/36

Geo. . . ., pro ep. Constanci., noviter electo, 23/7/35

Geo. de Bardessino, utr. iur. doc., 3/37

Geo. Berneker, pleb. in Visdigiez, Aquilegi. dio., 16/1/34

Geo. de Canalibus, utr. iur. doc., Taurin. dio., camera apost. cleric., 30/7/40

Geo. Gorff, prep. Omnium Sanctorum, Argentin. dio., o. Premon., 29/10/35

Geo. Kastmuller, pleb. in Veringen, Frising. dio. presb., 10/6/40

Geo. Meller, rect. parr. eccl. in Patzlin alias Hartkilchen, Ratispon. cio., in art. mag., 14/5/40

Geo. de Placencia, pro abb. s. Sepulcri et s. Sabini, cititatis Placentine, 22/10/34

Geo. de Saluciis, ep. August., 16/10/39

Geo. Spere, thes. s. Thome, Argentin., 10/37

Geo. Stannebergh, can.in Sestboch, 23/1/34

Geo. de Sweinberg, cant. et can. Bamberg., pro cap. Bamberg, 16/1/34

Geo. de Vallespeciosa, mag. in theo., o. herem. s. A., nom. marchionis Brandeburg., prov. Bavarie, 11/4/31

Geo. de Vegis, prep. s. Marie, Janu., 9/3/33

Geo. Vic., permanens usque ad concilii finem, ep., 7/37

Georius de Nusluwice, Leopoli., ardiac., 1-6/43

mag. Gerardus, o.P., sac. theo. prof., 23/2/33

Gerardus Branth, sac. theo. prof., amb. comitis Palatine, 4/5/32

Gerardus de Chanereyo, ab. mon. s. Eugendi Jur., Lugdun. dio., 23/10/39

Gerardus de Columpna, leg. doc., can. Vercell., pro et nom. ep. et cap. Vercell., 28/2/33

Ger. Folie, in leg. lic., 6/38

Ger. Gerardi, 3/9/34

mag. Ger. de Hoya, lic. in decr., 28/9/36

mag. Ger. Naudini, pro cap. August., prov. Tarantas., 22/5/39

mag. Ger. Perriere, dec. Cabilon., pro cap. Paris., 11/8/33

mag. Ger. Sucgerade, dec. eccl. coll. b. Marie Tornac., 2/9/35

Ger. Wedman de Xanctis, can. Xanctis, 25/6/34

mag. Gereardus Clepper, mag. in art., rect. parr. eccl. in Hyer, Traject. dio., nom. proprio, qui alias nom. proc. d. ducis Guelrie fuit inc., 10/6/40

Gerhardus Appt, can. Solodor. et in Wysentein, Lausan. et Constanc. dio., 12/6/39

Germanus, cubicularis d. card. Arelat., 19/10/36

Bernardus, Gerund. ep., 3/37

Ghiselbertus Herman, can. eccl. cath. Traiect., pro se et clero, 17/9/34

Ghisbertus Karoli, pro ab. s. Amandi in Pabula Tornac. dio., 23/7/35

fr. Ginetus Collacii, pr. priorat. Abiniaci, o. Cluniac., Nivern. dio., 16/10/39

Gisbertus de Rechfel, can. Traiect., 17/10/33

ep. Glasgu., 8/2/34 (Joannes Cameron)

Glaudius de Lahya, in theo. et decr. bac., 10/38

Glezenetus Terhonna, lic. in leg., ardiac. Cenoman., 12/11/34

Thom. de Stampino de Polonia, can. Gnezn., decr. doc. pro arep. Gnezn., 17/10/33

mag. Gobertus ad Pullos, lic. in leg., 13/8/34

Godeffridus Wsseghen de Bohemia, mag. in art., 4/3/33

Godofridus Bekel, ardiac. in Soltheshusen. in Verd. eccl., 2/5/33

Godefridus Berneblas, bac. in utr., 3-5/42

Godescaldus de Cimiterio, secretarius d. ep. Argentin., pro dicte ep., 16/1/33

Goffridus Berneblas, pro o.s.Guill., et mon. eiusdem, 16/7/35

fr. Gomecus, capel. d. s. Petri card., 30/3/36

Gondissaluus de Here de Orta Segontine, secularis ab., 9/38

Gosso de Kageneck, s. Thome Argentin. prep., 11/37

ep. Grac. 15/33 (Antonius de Romulus, o.P.)

ep. Gracianopolitan., 29/11/32 (Aymo de Chissiaco)

Gregorius, dec. eccl. Omnium Sanctorum, civitatis Prag. et can. eccl. cath., Prag., 17/12/34

Greg. Burbugh, 4/5/36

Berengarius de Cusano, Eln., proc. autem N. s. Grenati et Gervasii Claromont., 10/37

Guchardus Brundeti, lic. in decr. et bac. in theo., 29/11/32

mag. Gereardus Clepper, mag. in art., rect. parr. eccl. in Hyer, Traject. dio., nom. proprio, qui alias nom. proc. d. ducis Guelri fuit inc., 10/6/40

Guido Brissandi, rect. parr. eccl. s. Joh. supra Rixosam, Lugdun. dio., 27/5/40

Guido Flamocherii, pr. conv. Chamberiael, o.P., amb. ducis Sabaud., 11/9/31

Guido Furnerii, pr. priorat. de Cristello., o.s.B., Vabr. dio., 17/7/35

Guido Hardi, in leg. lic., thes. eccl. Nannet., 23/10/39

Guido Karkoent, lic. in utr. jur., pro Joh. de Nandillac, Joh. de Nandillac, ardiac. de Pago Casella in eccl. Tarracon., 7/8/39

fr. Guidomarus, in decr. lic., 5/38

Guido de Nestheriis, mag. in art. Paris., 10/2/33

Guido Olivarii, infirmarius eccl. Arelat., 16/7/35

Guido de Vercillis, mag., bac. in theo., adm. pro et nom. ep. Andegav., 8/6/33

Guido Vercellis, pro ep. Lucion., 15/10/34

mag. Guido de Villa Albi, can. Leon., in art. mag., bac. in decr., 13/11/33

Guilbertus de Villaribus, can. Albi., 3/8/36

fr. Guilelmus de Falone, precept. de Friburgo, o.s.Anth., Constanci. dio., 8/37

fr. Guilemus Sykardi, in decr. lic., 5/38

Guililmus Danielis, in utr. iur. bac., 6/37

Goffridus Berneblas, pro o.s.Guilelmi et mon. eiusdem, 16/7/35

Guillelmus Chiften, bac. in utr., 2/37

Guillelmus Pellicoti, in utr. bac., 10/38

Guil. Andree, dec. eccl. de Lanmoer, Dol. dio., bac. in decr., 15/4/40

Guil. de Auris, cleric. Ruth. dio. pro ab. Bonecumbe, o. Cist., 18/3/35

Guil. Austredi, pr. proirat. s. Michaelis de Balina, o.s.B., Vapiuc. dio., 25/6/39

Guil. Bergrum, 4/5/36

Guil. Barnahal, s. Anth. in Sargia, Viginti Miliensis prep., 7/38

Guil. de Barra, mag. in art. et bac. in leg., 22/6/36

mag. Guil. de Begha, leg. doc., 16/4/34

Guil. Benedicti, cap. ab. Bone Ballis, 9/7/32

Guil. Berede de Colonia, lic. in decr., 28/11/32

Guil. Bertrandi, mag. in art., de nobili genere, rect. parr. eccl. de Genesio, 24/4/39

Guil. de Bessa, can. Valentin., 24/4/33

Guil. Bingnon, presb. can. Turon., 14/5/34

Guil. Bloc, can. Tornac., pro d. ep. Tornac., 30/3/33

Guil. Bonaudi, pro o. s. Joh. Jher. et nom. proprio, 24/12/34

Guil. Borrelli, bac. in decr., pr. s. Jacobi de Casalombus, o.s.B., Eln. dio., 9/5/39

Guil. de Capella, ab. mon. Altecriste, Lausan. dio., o. Cist., 23/10/39

Guil. Cathalani, 27/8/34

fr. Guil. de Chadenayo, o.P., lect. Lugdun., 25/6/40

Guil., ab. mon. Chassanie, o. Cist., Lugdun. dio., 9/10/39

Guil. Chauveti, off. Verdun., lic. in decr., proc. coll., 26/2/32

Guil. Comitis, 27/10/36

Guil. Coulieti, lit. apost. abbr., 9/4/33

Guil. Croysier, ardiac. Demdalis, in eccl. Glasgu., 8/2/34

mag. Guil. de Cruce, secr. d. ep. Gracionopolitan., 26/1/33

fr. Guil. Damcot, bac. in decr., camerarius mon. s. Michaelis de Cusa, Taurin. dio., 19/2/40

Guil. de Deserto, 4/6/34

Guil. de Dombergh, ardiac. Moienn., 5/3/34

Guil. Droy, can. Vercell., in theo. bac., 10/11/41

Guil. Dudadi, montis Sysmii, Taurin. dio., prep, 11/12/42

Guil. Dueti, bac. in decr., can., ardiac., Castri Radulphi in eccl. Bituric., 12/6/34

Guil. Dursez, lic. in leg., rect. parr. eccl. de Grandicampo, Venet. dio., 21/8/39

Guil. Ebles, pro et nom. cap. Ruthen., o. can. reg., 18/3/33
-inc. pro prep. Montis Salvi, 18/9/33

Guil. Endeline, o. Carm., 23/5/32

Guil. Everardi, lic. in theo., amb. u. Paris., mag., 10/4/31

Guil. Fabri, dec. eccl. Dy., in leg. et in med. doc., 8/7/40

Guil. Figulli, 17/4/33

Guil. de Furnello, prep. eccl. cath. Tull., bac. in decr., 1/6/36

Guil. Georgii, mag. in art., can. eccl. b. Marie de Montelico, Bituric. dio., 23/7/34

Guil. Gerardi, mag. in art. et bac. in theo., Parisi., 2/4/34

Petrus de Mera et Guil. Gerardi de Ledis. decr. doc. pro ep. et clero Traiect., 2/4/34

fr. Guil. Hervei. bac. in decr., pr. priorat. de Rupe Moritonii, Abrinc. dio., 29/1/40

Guil. Josseaume, o.M. de observancia, 11/12/31

Guil. Kerguen, rect. eccl. parr. de Plebesini, Leon. dio., 30/7/40

Guil. de Layens, script. lit. conc., 11/5/36

Guil. de Layens, can. Laudun., pro ab. mon. s. Petri Altimont., o.s.B., Camerac. dio., 22/5/39

Guil. de Laignes, pr. priorat. s. Remigii de Melpigio, o.s.B., Xancton. dio., 11/5/40

Guil. de Laire, mag. in art. et bac. in theo., 24/4/34

Guil. Lene, rect. parr. eccl. de Ebran, Maclovi. dio., 27/5/40

Alf. Lupi de Heredia, bac. in decr., can. eccl. Conch., et. Raymundus Taloni, pro et nom. mag. Guil. de Lira, 21/10/35

Guil. de Littera, lic. in decr., prep. eccl. metropolitane Aq., 12/5/41

mag. Guil. de Locken, 15/3/34

Guil. Lozoch, presb., bac. in decr., can. Venet. et rect. parr. eccl. de Crach, Venet. dio., 31/7/39

Guil. Melleant, presb. nobilis ex utr. parente, rect. parr. eccl. de Monteur, Nannet. dio., 20/5/40

Guil. Militis, pr. s. Netterii, lic. in decr., pro ab. Case Dei, 21/8/34

Guil. de Monchannellon, presb. Edu., mag. in art., can. Cabilon. et Matiscon. ecclesiarum, cur. parr. eccl. s. Martini de Colchiis, Edu. dio., 25/7/39

Guil. de Monixuli, can. Leon., 18/6/34

Guil. de Monte, pr. Paterniaci, 26/2/32

Guil. Morelli, precentor, Nemau., o. can. reg., 14/1/34

Guil. Mossellis, presb. Claro. dio., rect. parr. eccl. de Wizi, Lausan. dio., familiaris arep. Tarentasi., 4/12/39

Guil. Moteti, presb. cur. eccl. s. Petri Romeliaci subtus Cornelionem, Gebenn. dio., 17/3/41

Guil. Nepotis, mag. in art., 18/9/33

mag. Guil. Quadrigarii, leg. doc., amb. reg. Francie, 3/11/36

mag. Guil. Rolandi, lic. in decr., can. Cenoman., 14/7/36

Guil. Rollandi, in decr. lic., pro d. Rogero de Hautepin, in art. mag., can. Tur., consiliario ill. d. ducis Alanconii, 26/10/39

Guil. Salez, in utr. lic. pro ep. Malleac., 14/5/34

Guill., electus confirmatus mon. s. Andree in Gouffern., dio Sagi. et bac. form. in theo., 25/7/39

Guill. de la Sauerge, proc. mon. Montis Maioris, 27/2/33

Guill. Scac, mag. in art., can. s. Dionisii, Leodi., 23/1/34

Guill. Studer, rect. parr. eccl. b. Nicolai, opidi Freiburg., Lausan. dio., 1/6/36

Guill. de Testa, decr. lic., 4/37

Guill. Teste, 29/4/35

Guill. Textoris, bac. in decr., monachus eccl. s. Poncii Thomerarium. pr. priorat. conv. de Cauna, Castr. dio., 12/11/34 fr. Guil., prep. mon. in Thingen, pro prelatis can. reg. Constanci. dio., 23/1/34

fr. Guil. Thome, pr. priorat. de Gadello, o.s.B., Maclov. dio., 2/12/40

Guil. de Tillia, bac. in decr., rect. parr. eccl. de Vicolo, Vaur. dio., 28/3/38

Guil. Toquinet, lic. in decr., rect. parr. eccl. de Messac, Redon. dio., 15/5/39

Guill., arpresb. eccl. Castellane de Veneciis, 15/3/34

Guil. Vignerii, notarius camere apost., 13/11/33

Guil. de Weghe, leg. doc., pro se ipso et dd. de o. s. Joh. Jher., 4/12/33

fr. Guil. Worillon, o.M., proc. provincie Turon., 18/9/33

Guillielmus Anscherii, in leg. lic., 11/38

Guillielmus Naemendi, in leg. lic., 1-2/39

Guillielmus Cartmer, electus in ab. de Levans, Venet. dio., 12/38

Guillielmus, mon. Otterback., Trever. dio., ab., 11/38

Guillielmus, s. Lupi, Trec. ab., 11/38

fr. Guiscard Journeti, pr. conv. de Aurelio, Lemovic. dio., o.s.A., 5/3/34

Gundisslavus Dalbornis, can. Seguntin., 9/2/33

Gundissalvus Joh., can. Mindon., 22/1/34

Gundissalvus de Medina, 28/11/32
-nom. cap. Tud., 30/4/34

Gundissalvus de Servantes, scol. et can. Ipsal., 5/10/36

quidam doc. decr. nom. ep. et cleri, Halberstad., 11/12/31

mag. Petrus Bailliui, can. Paris., religiosus de Hasnonie, 23/2/32
-pro ab. de Hasnonio, tamen quamvis fuerit adm., d. deputati debent deliberare. Nota quod mag. Egidius Carlerii se opposuit., 27/6/32

proc. ep. Havelberg., 11/4/32

Heinricus de Fulingen, prep. s. Sixti in Halirchain, 8/37

Heinricus Karoli, o.M., lect. conv. Argentin., 1-2/42

Helbicus de Bopardia, dec. Wesal., nuncio arep. Colon. et Magunt., 28/2/32
-proc. cleri, communis civitatis et dio. Trever., 4/3/32

ab. de Helhuzen, o. Cist., Paderburn. dio., 15/9/36

Helias Gaufridi, can. Petragoric., 30/3/36

Hellinus de Clipeto, arpresb. Leodi. de militari genere procreatus, 4/12/39

Helmholdus Steynhus, can. s. Crucis, Hildesm., 26/5/33

Henningus Storbeke, vicedominus eccl. Magdeburg., 25/9/33

Stephanus Yver, in personam mag. Henricci. de Biuria, proc., 29/5/33

Henriccus, s. Blasii, celearius mon. s. Blasii, 17/4/32

mag. Henriccus Varonte, decr. doc., can. eccl. Patavi. et Frising., 13/11/33

Henricus de o.P., 29/3/32

Henricus Amen, prep. eccl. cath. Eistet., 20/6/39

mag. Hen. Andree de Swevia inferiori, bac. in decr., studii Parisi. necnon studens in sac. theo. Coloni. per octo anno, 17/2/41

off. Basili., Hen. de Beinheim, prom. conc., 4/3/31

mag. Hen. Baldenberg, ardiac. Parchim. in eccl., Zwerin. nom. proprio, quia alias nomine procuratorio., 12/6/39

Hen. de Bemel, decr. doc., can ss. Apostolorum, Coloni., 1/12/40

Hen. de Bercka, mag. art. et in decr. bac., vic. in eccl. Coloni., 3/7/39

Hen. Bierwisch, can. eccl. b. Marie, Halberstad., rect. parr. eccl. in Ronyt, Salzeburg. dio., 15/4/40 mag. Hen. Bone, vic. eccl. Basil., 7/5/40

fr. Hen., pr. de Boulencuria, 17/4/34

Hen. Brasque, can. eccl. cath. Lubic., 22/5/39

Hen. Caldisse, o.P., amb. arep. Maguntin., inq. German., mag. in theo., 24/3/32

Hen. Engelhardi, can. Misn., 2/11/39

Hen., ab. in Ettenhenmunster, o.s.B., Argentin. dio., 23/7/40

Hen. Flekel, decr. doc., 7/2/32

Hen. Gant, decr. doc., can. Coloni., 5/5/33

Hen. Grauental, rect. eccl. parr. in Abesperg, Eistent. dio., presb., 1/7/40

Hen. Gullopori, bac. in leg., rect. parr. eccl. de Sainteve, Venet. dio., 21/8/39

Hen. Jan, pleb. eccl. parr. in Blanckenberg, Maguntin. dio., 13/5/40

Hen. Yesperlini, dec. Sedun., 23/11/39

Hen. Kach, rect. parr. eccl. b. Marie Osnaburg., 5/6/39

Hen. Karsaw, in decr. lic., 8/38

Hen. de Kirchberg, lic. in decr., 9-10/42

Hen. Moger, in art. mag., Maguntin. dio., 30/7/40

Hen. Nenninger, decr. doc., off. Wormac., 23/10/39

Hen. Ner, Prep. eccl. coll. s. Ymeri, Lausan. dio., 5/6/39

Hen. Nithart, rect. Ulm., nom. cap. eccl. Constanci., doc. decr., can. Constanci., 11/12/31

Hen. Pierenleen, o.s.A. herem., Basili., 17/7/39

Henric. de Prato, rect. parr. eccl. de Pleodider, Leon.,dio., 18/12/39

Hen. Rabensteiner, nobilis de militari genere procreatus, can. eccl. Bamberg. et rect. parr. eccl. in Slucht, Ratispon. dio., 9/5/39

Henr. Rascop, abbr., qui noviter venit de Romana curia, 14/7/32

Hen. de Ruth, ardiac. in Trever., 11/38

Hen. de Sakoneyo, doc. utr. iur., sacrist., Lugdun. ac ardiac. Meld., 23/10/39

Hen. Schater, art. et med. doc., dec. eccl. Traiect., pro r. p. d. Swedero, ep. Traiect. et clero, 17/9/31

Hen. Schinttler, rect. parr. eccl. in Sechssenheim, can. s. Joh. in Heugis, extra muros Herbipol., 19/8/40

Hen., utr. iur. doc., can. Traiect. 12/12/32

Hen. Tamheim, utr. iur. doc., de Brisaco, Constanci. dio., 1/9/41

Hen. Tock, can. Magdegurg., amb. arep. Magdeburg., mag., dec. Ratispon., 24/3/32
-proc. ep. Lubic., 13/9/32

mag. Hen. Ubellin, proc. d. dec. Wormac., 28/4/40

Hen. Vrund, med. doc., 11-12/42

Hen. Waserer, ardiac. in eccl. Zwerin., 5/38

Hen. Wernhart de Bischoffwiler, can. Salzburg. et Haselac., 30/7/40

mag. Henr., o.M., 9/7/32

Henr. de Alba, bac. in decr. et can. Met., 2/4/34

Henr. Attender, can. s. Andree, Coloni., pro ep. Curi., 16/1/34

Henr. de Beuria, can. Morin., 3/10/32

Henr. Boydembergh, ardiac. Pargin. in eccl. Swerin., 2/4/34

Henr. Boldenberch, can. Butzoy., pro ep. Reval., 14/1/35

Henr. de Bona, 4/6/34

Henr. de Changiaco, bac. in leg., can. s. Justi, Lugdun., 23/3/36

Henr. de Cocher, pro ab. mon. Montis s. Petri, Maguntin. dio., 17/4/33

Henr. Collart, mag. in art., can. Aqu., 16/9/35

Henr. de Dyest, decr. doc., pro ep. Warmac., 30/1/33

Henr. Herpil, prep. Severin., Coloni., pro d. arep. Coloni., 22/8/32

mag. Henr. Hubelin, can. Brix., pro arep. Visal., 5/3/34

Henr. Hubelin, pro pr. s. Georgii, o. can. reg., 4/5/36

mag. Henr. de Jancussio, decr. doc., presb., 2/4/34

Henr. de Judeis, leg. doc., 6/7/36

Henr. de Keppel, vicedominus Monaster., nom. ep. Monasteri., 24/10/32

Henr. de Kowibourg, lic. in decr., can. Nuemburg., 9/3/36

Henr. de Limphiis, decr. doc., 9/4/34

mag. Henr. Lueyelhinc, lic. in decr., can. et thes. eccl. cath. Minden., 16/9/35

Henr. Manger, decr. doc., can. Turic., 24/3/33

Henr., ab. s. Egidii, Nuremberg., decr. doc., 18/6/34

Henr. Olland, familiar. d. card. leg., 24/10/32

Henr. Plotten, can. eccl. cath. Zwerin., rect. parr. eccl. in Beringh., Leodi. dio., 3/11/36

Henr. Prepositi, lic. in decr., 24/4/34

Henr. de Rouen, decr. doc., dec. eccl. Magdeburg., 4/2/33

Henr., ab. mon. Sali., o. Clun., 14/1/34

fr. Henr., can. s. Crucis de Scocia, lic. decr., 30/4/34

mag. Henr. Weber, in decr. bac., 26/8/35

Herbrardus de Lippio, prof. theo., proc. ep.,prep., dec. et cap., Lubic., 2/8/32

Alb. Schenk de Limpurch, decr. doc., can. Herbipol. et proc. cap. Herbipol., 6/6/32

Symon de Valle, aud. card. Bononi., 16/5/32
-nom. cap. et civium Herbipol., 7/2/33

Joh. Duwer, doc. pro ep. Herbipol., 26/7/32

Joh. de Bachemstein, prep. eccl. Herbipol., proc. et nom. proc. r. p. d. Sigismundi, ep. Herbipol. et Samon. ducis, 20/10/41

Hermanos Boiste, ardiac. Suan. in eccl. Camin., 10/10/32

Herm. de Camanaul, cant. Leon., 7/37

Herm. de mon. Campi s. Marie, Cist. o., 18/6/34

fr. Herm. de Cronenbergh, precept. s. Joh. Jher., Trever., 30/3/36

Herm. de Fleyaco, Tull. dyo., elect. in ab., 9/38

Herm. Geroldi, can. Zuxer Marther, 28/3/38

Herm. de Heldisem, mag. in theo., 27/6/32

Herm. Leder, notarius, 14/5/35

mag. Herm. de Nussia, o. Carm., 27/8/34

mag. Herm. de Osta, benefic. in eccl., Halberstad., 23/10/39

Herm. Pentel, ardiac. in Heczel in eccl. Minden., 3/9/34

Herm., ss. Petri et Andree, Paderborn, dec., 6/37

Herm. Regelhusen, can. Padebrun., pro. cap., 2/4/34

Herm. Roseman, pr. et lect. conv., o.P , Essili. civitatis, 29/10/39

Herm. Rosemberg, decr. doc., 12/37

Herm. Rost, lic. in decr., dec. eccl. b. Marie virginis maioris, Maguntin., 24/3/32

Herm. Ruwe, de Almelo, rect. parr. eccl. in Melle, Osnaburg. dio., 4/9/39

Herm., provincialis Saxonie, o.M., 9/7/32 mag. Hernestus Dusel, secretarii Spire translati, 19/5/32

Herneus Carle, lic. in leg. et bac. in decr., 24/4/39

Herveus Bau, pr. de Versio, 19/9/32

Herveus Carii, in decr. lic. et bac. in leg., can. eccl. s. Martini, Turon., 21/8/39

Herveus de Cornubia, lit. apost. abbrev., 19/9/34

Herveus, s. Geldaiss, Nanet. dio., ab., 10/37

Herv. Gueriet, lic. in decr., dec. Guercie, Redon. dio., 7/5/40

mag. Herveus de Kegrgent, nobilis ex utr. parente, cleric. Corisopit. dio., in art. mag., 3/6/40

Heuguenetus, bac. in dec., can. eccl. Tul. 25/6/39

mag. Joh. Roden, pro ardiac. Heldesm., 30/7/34

mag. Joh. Colcach, lic. in decr., dec. s. Andree Heldesm., pro ep. prelatisque et clero civitatis, 30/8/32

Joh. Christiani de Alwelde, dec. eccl. s. Crucis Hildesm. pro ep. et clero Hildesm., 13/11/33

Hillebrandus Griseuitz, prep. Cziz. et can. eccl. cath. Nuember., 29/7/35

Honoratus Augerii, can. Grass., 13/1/36

Hubertus de Niquesola, can. Veron., 19/3/34

Hugo, pr. priorat. de Donis, Narbon. dio., 19/12/32

Hugo Aureliaco, bac. in decr., can. Caturc., 27/4/36

Hugo Barardi, off. Tull., nuncio ep. Tull., proc. ep. et cleri Tull., 12/31

Hugo Bellomonte, precept. s. Anthonii Basili., nom. ab. s. Anth., 16/5/32

Hugo Bolerii, rect. s. Michaelis Vallis Cluse, Bisunt. dio., 27/11/39

Hugo Denies, dec. Autissiodor., 2/6/32

Hugo Flamingi, cant. Nivern., 22/5/33

fr. Hugo Furdi, alias de Capella, pr. s. Georgii, Gebenn. dio., 15/4/40

Hugo Humberti, can. Gebenn., in decr. bac., 9/12/40

Hugo, capel. quondam d. Constanci, prov. Rothomag., cap. s. Lazari in eccl. cath. Lingon., 23/12/39

Hugo Pellisarii, can. et ardiac., lector., 3/9/34

Hugo de Podio, in decr. bac., cleric.Ruthen. dio., 7/10/40

mag. Hugo de Rot, pro cap. Spir. doc., 13/11/33

Hugo de Sarciis, Francie, precept. o.s. Joh. Jher., 10/38

Hugo Sauseris, prep. Venci., 26/11/34

Hugo de Strigham, dec. Osnaburg., 9/38

Hugo de Villamari, cant. Autisiodor., 12/37

Hulricus Dusther, lic. in decr., can. b. Marie veteris capelle, 30/4/34

Humbertus Anglici, prep. s. Egidii, August. dio., decr. doc., 23/1/40

Humbertus Anshelmi, bac. in theo., legens actu Divi., o.M., 24/4/39

Humbertus de Birone, precept. s. Anth., Flandr., 12/11/34

Humbertus de Franckfordia, cant. et can. eccl. coll. mon. Grandis Vallis, necnon rect. eccl. parr. Montis Falconis, Basili. dio., vic. gen. in spiritualibus d. ep. Basili., 3/6/40

Humbertus Gudodi, rect. eccl. parr. de Mataclone, Lugdun. dio., nobilis ex utr. parente, 23/7/40

Humbertus Machardi, in art. mag., bac. in decr., lit. apost. script., 1/7/40

Humbertus Rollandi, 26/3/35

Humbertus Roseti, pr. de Villeta, o.b. Benedicti, Lugdun. dio., 10/11/41 ab. Husow. de Espurg, o.s.B., August. dio., 19/8/35

Hustinus Paulini, pro ep. Tull., 20/4/34

fr. J. o.s.B , pro ab. Cernac., dio. Cracovi. in Polonia, 14/1/34

mag. J. de Werder, can. et cant. eccl. Magdeburg., 3/7/39

fr. Jac. de Advocatis, Gazenonis, pr. Capriaci, o.s. A , Vercell. dio., 1/9/41

mag. Jac. Alberti, can. Ebred. nom. cap. Ebredun., cap. Valent., et. cap. Di., 12/9/32

Jac. Ancheni, ardiac. et can. Massili., 12/10/36

mag. Jac. de Attigniaco, utr. iur. doc., can. Rem., nom. suo proprio et cap. Rem. et cap. Cathalaun., 24/4/33
-adm. est pro cap. Laudun., 13/6/33

Jac. Audrueti, cant. et can. Sedun., 19/8/40

fr. Jac., o. Carm., mag. in theo., 19/3/34

Jac., prep. de Enonio, o. can. reg., 29/3/38

Jac. Ferdinandi de Bourges, rect. parr. eccl. de Almans, Cesaraugustan. dio., bac. in leg., 12/2/40

Jac. Gerbaudi, ab. pronunciatus mon. Omnium Sanctorum in Insula Cathalaun., o. can. reg., 7/34

fr. Jac. Peres, presb. monachus mon. Arularum, o. Cluni., Eln. dio., 31/7/39

Jac. de Pratis, 16/6/33

Iac., electus Segobric., 3/38

mag. Iac. de Belloforti, 11/5/36

Jac. Brus, pro ab. mon. s. Crucis de Edinwourg, o.s.A., s. Andree dio., 18/3/35

Jac. Brus, mag. in art., can. Aberdon., 18/6/34

Jac. Buneti, in utr. iur. bac., 26/6/40

Jac. de Campis, can. Turon., adm. pro cap. Bituric., 5/9/33

Jac. Caprane, in utr. iur. bac., 30/3/36

fr. Jac. de la Cavaleria, lic. in decr., pr. de Escheya, Cesauragust. dio., o.s.B., 5/10/36

Jac. de Cerveriis, lit. sac. concilii script., 21/6/40

Jac. Clant, 19/5/34

Jac. de Clausaburga, 14/11/32

Jac. a Cortibo, presb., ardiac. Archadi., 14/5/34

Jac., prep. s. Hedwigis extra muros Cracovi., mag. in theo., 4/3/40

Jac. Cruik, lic. in leg., 1/10/34

Jac. Deportus, rect. parr. eccl. s. Martini, Ayma Villan, August. dio., 25/6/39

Jac. Disschinger de Eslinga, mag. in art., Constanci. dio., 29/4/40

fr. Jac. de Foresta, bac. in decr., dec. eccl. de Lenterney, Lugdun. dio., 4/3/40

Jac. Frishaimer de Ratispona, 29/2/32

Iac. de Gandiaco, succentor Narbonn., 7/38

fr. Jac. Godart, pr. de Framerio, Aurelian., 17/10/33

Jac. Gourdesii, presb. pr. eccl. secular. de Bastdiem, Jordanorum, Aqu. dio., 10/4/41

Jac. de Gramineis, 2/4/34

Jac. Gramisz, 14/1/35

Jac. Grone, pro arep. Rig., 23/1/34

Iac. Iackeri, s. Petri de Zancon, prep., 3/38

Jac. Juglis, bac. in leg., nobilis ex utr. parente, thes. eccl. Glasgu., 24/4/39

Jac. Kraenleide, mag. in art., can. Xanct., Coloni. dio., 10/3/41

Jac. Lalement., lic. in decr., 22/5/39

Jac. Laueri, elect. Morbacen., o.s.B., Basili. dio., 25/6/34

fr. Jac. Liess, pr. conv. Dordrac., o.s.A., Traject. dio., 1/10/40

Jac. Locher, prep. Brixin., 12/37

Jac. Macellarii, can. pro cap. Ebredun., 22/5/33

Jac. Nicolai, rect. parr. eccl. in Wayebors, Gnezn. dio., 23/1/40

Jac. Patrus, cur. s. Petri de Promasuis, Lausan. dio., capel. d. card. s. Sixti, 18/8/41

Jac., p. d. Martini ep. Petin., prov. Aquilegi., tam proc. nom. proprio, 12/5/41

Jac. Petri, lit. apost. abbr., can. et thes. s. Salvatoris, Traiect., 1/12/36

fr. Jac. de Pisis, o.P., pro clero Ragusin., 30/4/34

Jac. de Ponte. pr. priorat. de Camera, Maurian. dio., 23/9/41

fr. Jac. Rinault, pr. priorat. s. Crispini, prope civitatem Nanet., o.s.B., 20/11/39

mag. Jac. Robaille, can. Ambian. pro cap. Ambian. et nom. proprio, 30/5/32
-proc. Ludov. Scaec, 6/7/32

Jac. Roricii, scol. eccl. coll. b. Marie in campis extra muros Maguntin., 5/6/39

Iacobus Sala, doc. decr., 1-2/39

mag. Jac. Schellenberg, rect. eccl. parr. in Heymersheim, Coloni. dio., 23/12/39

Jac., eccl. s. Andree in Scocia electus., 23/6/41

Jac., o.s.B., Verd. dio., Scovetroc. ab., 11-12/42

Jac. Steze, bac. in decr., beneficiatus parr. eccl. in Wolgast, Camin. dio., 28/7/41

Jac., ab. Secusia, o.s.B., Taurin. dio., 26/10/39

Jac. de Sirk, scol. eccl. Trever., prothonotarius apost., 1/32

Jac. Sundelbak, can. ss. IIII doctorum ecclesiae, Monasteri., 20/11/39

Jac. de Tibore, 19/11/34

Jac. Vassoris, mag. in art., 2/10/33

Jac. de Verone, presb., Vercell. dio., bac. in decr., 20/11/39

Jac. de Verono, presb. Vercell. dio., bac. in decr., nobilis ex utr. parente, bull. apost. abbrev., 23/11/39

Jac. Wisse, ardiac. de Bitello in eccl. Tull., de militari genere procreatus, 26/8/35

Iac. de Verono, Yporring., 3-5/42

arep. Dyadi. (Jadr.), 15/5/33 (Laurentius Venerius, o.P.)

ab. s. Stephani, Janu., 18/9/33

mag. Jheronimus, provincialis Carm., prov. Janu., pro d. arep. Janu., 25/4/32

mag. Jeronimus Gothelzanck, prep. eccl. Plomuc., tam nom. proprio quam proc. r. p. d. Nicolai, in arep. eccl. Prag. electi et provisi, 3/11/41

fr. Jeronimus de Praga, o.s.Joh. Jher., mag. in theo., 26/9/32

mag. Jher., prov. Carm., prov. Janu., pro d. arep. Janu., 25/4/32

proc. G., Ylerd. ep., 12/38

secr. d. card. Ilerd., nom. suo proprio, 22/8/32

Ymbertum de Chissiaco, lic. in leg., precentor Biter., 5/5/33
-pro et nom. cap. Agath., 5/5/33
-proc. loco d. ep. Carcason., 5/6/33

ep. Emiliac. in Ybernia (Imelacen), 5/5/33 (Thom. de Burgh)

Ingeninus Pranndel, can. Brix., 23/9/35

Ingeramnus Landesay, precentor eccl. Moravi., decr. doc., 13/8/34

Ioan., in leg. lic., 10/38

Ioan. Amergasii, ardiac. Dertus., 6/38

Ioan. Bertonelli, precept. Lemovic., o.s.Anth., 5/38

Ioan. de Climaco, in eccl. Edu., secularis abbas, 9/38

Ioan. de Corcellis, decr. doc., 1/38

Ioan. Cukefelet, in utr. bac., 10/38

Ioan. de Fonte, in theo. mag., 1/38

Ioan. Hammonis, in decr. lic., 9/38

Ioan. Mydilhusen, 5/38

Ioan. Moyse, 9/38

proc. s. Petri Lovi. ab. Ioan. Rokoles, in decr. lic., 4/38

Ioan. s. Rodesindi, de Cella Nova, Aurelian. dio., mon. ab., 10/38.

Ioan. de Salice, sacrist. s. Salvatoris de Beida, Gerund., 7/38

mag. Ioan. de Tornaco, permanens usque in finem concilii, 10/38

Ioan., s. Ioannis in Similem, Traiect., secular. ab., 9/38

Job, cum socio pro d. translato Trever., 2/1/33

fr. Jodericus de Fassis, prep. s. Petri de Tirrallis, Cav. dio., o.s.B., bac. in decr., 23/11/39

Jodocus de Lysa, in sac. pag. professor., pro d. ep. Tornac., 30/3/33

Joffridus, abb. de Combergh, Herbipol., 23/1/34

ab. s. Joh., 28/11/32

Joh. Adelmer, lic. in theo., vic. de Memmiier, Dunkeld. dio., 23/6/41

Joh. Adversarius, 27/10/36

Joh. Alabonne, dec. eccl. coll. de Mortonio, Abric. dio., 23/7/35

fr. Joh. Albaneti, pr. de Latis, 26/9/32
Joh. Albaneti, pr. de Ladis, Magolonen. dio., o. can. reg., pro et nom. d. ab. Savilliani, 4/2/34

Joh. Allegie, can. Cirasontin. (recte: Tirasonen.), 28/3/38

Joh. Alrayo, clericus Venet. dio., mag. in art., pr. priorat. secularis s. Nicolai extra muros Venet., 25/7/39

Joh. de Amasiaco, can. Lugdun., 10/10/32

Joh. Amici, can. Tholon., 26/10/39

Joh. de Anaca, can. eccl. Panormitan., 23/7/40

Joh. Anhem, can. Tridentin., pro prep. b. Marie in Grien & s. Michael., Tridentin. dio., o. can. reg., 6/7/36

Joh. Annagni, lector conventus, Argentin., o. M., 1-2/42

fr. Joh. Antonii, pro ab. Vallismagne, Agaten. dio., o. Cist., 28/7/36

Joh. Arbosse, can. eccl. cath. Magalonen., bac. in decr., pr. priorat. b.Marie de Latis, o.s. Aug., dicte dio., 23/10/39

fr. Joh. Archenbaut, 17/4/33

Joh. Archerii, mag. in theo., proc. ep. Lingonen., 17/11/32

Joh. Arditi, can. eccl. cath. Elnen., lic. in decr., 12/6/39

Joh. Arnulphi, mag. in art. et lic. in decr., proc. et nom. proc. d. arep. Viennen., 5/11/32
-adm. in proc. pro et nom. cap. coll. de Romanis, Viennen. dio., 12/8/33

Joh. Arnulphi, presb., can. Tullen., 18/5/36

Joh. de Avelde, 21/5/34

Joh. de Aureliaco, pr. de Marbosio, o. Clun, Lugdun. dio., bac. in decr., familiaris d. Arelat., 19/8/35

Joh. de Bachemstein, prep. eccl. Herbipol., proc. et nom. proc. r. p. d. Sigismundi, ep. Herbipol. et Saconi ducis, 20/10/41

Joh. Bachenstein, decr. doc., 10/10/32

Joh. Bagueti, de nobili genere procreatus, bac. in decr., can. S. Justi Lugdun., rect. parr. s. Germani, Lugdun. dio., 23/7/39

Joh. Balcheber, in decr. lic., rect. parr. eccl. de Vallibus, Tarracon. dio., per proc., videlicet d. Lucam Roures, rect. eccl. s. Vincencii, Valentin., 26/2/40

Joh. Balcii, can. eccl. Magalon., pr. priorat. s. Andree de Bodia, Magalon. dio., in decr. bac., 3/11/36

Joh. de Balma, in decr. lic., 8/37

Joh. Barat, o. Carm., mag. in theo., 27/6/32

Joh. Barbarini, rect. eccl. parr., Villamuris, Aqu. dio., 1/7/40

Joh. Barbi, lic. in decr., 18/3/35

Ioh. Barbuti, leg. lic., 1-2/39

Joh. de Batuto, can. Ruthen., 4/2/33

fr. Joh. de Baufrenos, o. M. de observancia, 1/10/34

Joh. Belier, litt. apost. script., 24/4/33

Joh. Belino, pleb. s. Johannis Baptiste, can. Clugi., 7/5/34

Joh. Bellaye, mag. in theo., regens in u. Avinion., o. M., 5/11/34

Joh. Bende, 17/10/33

Joh. Berengarii, litt. apost. abbr., 14/5/34

Joh. Bernardi, 9/11/36

Joh. Bernheri, presb. Maguntin. dio., perpetuus vic. in eccl. Basil., ejusdem d. ep. Vis. familiaris et capel., 25/7/39

fr. Joh. Berteleti, pr. capelle Monasterioli, Pictavi. dio., 26/10/39

Ioh. Bertonelli, precept. Lemovic., o.s. Anth., 5/38

Joh. Bidagud, in utr. iur. bac., 7/37

Joh. Blanquy, can. mon. s. Ruffi Valenci., o.s.A., decr. doc., 24/3/41

Joh. Blaterwick, decr. doc., 11-12/42

Joh. Blondeleti, bac. form. in theo., dec. Cathalan., pro rege Ludovico, 4/6/34

fr. Joh. Blondelli, prep. Montis Melniani, o.s.B., Paris. dio., in theo. bac., 13/5/40

Joh. Blouvoet de Oelpe, can. eccl. b. Marie in Palaciolo extra muros Trever., 23/12/39

fr. Joh. Bockardi, in theo. mag., o. P., 25/6/40

Joh. Bomodi, bac.in decr., beneficiatus in eccl. s. Ypoliti de Polignaco, Bisuntin. dio., 28/3/38

Joh. Bonitemporis, 27/10/36

Joh. de Boperdia, mag. in theo., o. Carm., 24/10/32

Joh. Botadi, Matiscon. can., et rect. parr. eccl. de Bellomont., Gebenn. dio., 3/11/36

Joh. Bottini, pr. priorat. s. Thome de Conaco, o.s.B., Xanctonl dio., 23/4/40

Joh. de Boulengnes, decr. doc., 11/8/33

Joh. de Brachio, can. Aqu., 28/7/36

Joh. Bracht, can. eccl. s. Mauricii extra muros civitatis Monasteri., 19/7/43

mag. Joh. de Bramaste, ardiac. Starp. in eccl. Camin., 3/6/35

Joh., can. eccl. Brandeburg., proc. ep. Brandeburg., 14/3/32

Joh. Brant, presb. pr. priorat. de Welpaco et provisor in Bussess., o. Clun., Basili. dio., 20/10/41

Joh. Brasandi, vestiarius s. Pauli, Bisuntin. dio., 10/37

Joh. Brassart, presb. Leodi., 5/6/33

Joh. Brich, bac. in decr., gardianus de Robiaco, o. M., Basili. dio., 25/8/41

Joh. Brillandi, mag. in art., can. eccl. Maclovi., presb., 4/12/39

Joh. Brillon, 4/3/35

Joh. Britonell, bac. in theo., 30/7/34

Joh. Britonis, can. Maclovi., mag. in art., bac. in decr., 28/9/38

mag. Joh. Britonis, in art. mag., rect. eccl. parr. de Chernceyo, Abrinc. dio., 29/1/40

Joh. Britonis, rect. parr. eccl. de Tredaneel, Brioc. dio., 23/7/40

fr. Ioh. de Burgo, s. Anth. de Herba, Mediolan. prep., 1-2/39

Joh. de Camera, mag. in art., can. Abredun., 23/6/41

Joh. de Caminata, decr. doc., can. Coloni. s. Andree, 13/4/36

Joh. Capizaco, pleb. s. Juliani de Veneciis, 30/4/34

Joh. Carillo, ardiac. Conch., 10/2/33

Joh. Carlerii, 10/10/32

Joh. Carponis, Zabicotr., Cracovi., 11-12/42

fr. Joh. de Casseyo, prep. de Lusignano, o.s.B., Narbon. dio., 5/3/34

fr. Joh. nuncius regis Castelle, o.P., mag. in theo., 30/8/32

Joh. Castellione, 12/6/34

Joh. Celi, amb. u. Wienn. Alberti, duc. Austri., prov. Bavari., o. Augustin., pro et nom. prep. Wienn., 5/7/32
ep. Freising. constituit suum mag. Joh. Celi, . . . pro ipso . . . in concilio, 26/1/33

Joh. Champaneti (Sapaneti), mag. in art., bac. in leg., 26/2/32

fr. Joh. de Chanziaco, pr. de Amberta, o.s.B., Lugdun. dio., 20/7/36

Joh. de Chauureyo, precentor eccl. Lugdun. pro eccl. Bisuntin, 21/8/32

Joh. Cherrerii, precentor Lugdun., 17/4/33
-adm. pro cap. Vienn., 17/6/33

Joh. de Chissiaco, in leg. lic., 4/37

Joh. Christiani de Alwelde, dec. eccl. s. Crucis, Hildesm. pro ep. et clero, 13/11/33

Joh. Cilly, lic. in leg., 24/4/33

fr. Joh. de Cipro, bac. form. in theo., 30/3/34

Joh. Cisterci., mag. in theo., 11/4/31

fr. Joh. Clareti, camerarius mon. s. Petri de Nanto ac pr. priorat. b. Marie de Celcleriis, o.s.B., Vabr. dio., 3/6/40

Joh. Clementis, presb. rect. parr. eccl. de Gugincuria, Tull., bac. in decr., 14/8/39

Joh. Cochetiree, lic. in decr., 17/10/33

mag. Joh. Colcach, lic. in decr., dec. s. Andree Hildesm. pro ep., prelatisque, et clero civitatis, 30/8/32

mag. Joh. Coleti, presb., in decr. lic. pro abb. s. Audeoni, Rothomag. et suo nom. proprio, 21/4/33

fr. Joh. de Colomberio, pr. de Fontenoto in Vosago, adm. pro ab. d. Fauerneyto, 8/6/33

Joh. de Conseburg, mag. in art., can. Maclini., 22/6/36

Joh. Consul, cantor Redon., 9/2/33

Joh. Cornelii, proc. Ludovic. Scaec, 6/7/32

Joh. Cortini, mag. in art., in decr. lic. et bac. in leg., can. Laudun., 12/6/39

mag. Joh. Costin, lic. in decr., 14/5/35

Joh. Crech, prep. eccl. b. Marie Gotensis, Maguntin. dio., 28/7/36

Joh. Cristini, presb. rect. parr. eccl. s. Piati de Tors, Tarentasi. dio., 28/4/41

Joh. Crousardi, dec. de Yuodio, Trever. dio., 27/10/36

Joh. Crowel, ardiac. Pomeranus in eccl. Ladislavi., 24/12/34

Joh. Cruchten, dec. s. Paulini extra muros Trever., 17/10/32

Joh. Crusenach, can. Mozebac. Herbipol. dio., 23/1/34

Joh. de Currali, mag. in theo., 22/10/34

Joh. Dalbinaco, in decr. bac. et nobilis, 13/5/40

Joh. Declin, rect. parr. eccl. du Boutehel, bac. in leg. Maclovi. dio., 4/12/39

mag. Joh. Demder de Haspergh, o. Heremit. s. Aug., 22/5/33

Joh. Derriani, presb. vic. de Boya, Venet. dio., 1/7/40

Joh. de Dich, lit. apost.abbr., 20/11/33

Joh. Didaci, decr. doc., abb. de Cernatos, proc. d. ep. Burgensis, 22/10/34
-proc. s. Emiliani, 14/5/35

Joh. Dieulfist, proc. cap. Baioc., de familia d. elect. Baionenc., 11/7/32
-pro cap. Lexovi., 11/2/35

mag. Joh. Diist, 2/10/33

Joh. de Dinczlacken, bac. in theo., mag. in art., regens in u. Coloni., 3/10/39

Joh. Dionii, cur. s. Benigni, Met., pr. ab. S. Arnulphi, Met., 30/3/33

mag. Joh. Dirreau, ardiac. de Sabolio in eccl. Cenoman., 18/8/36

mag. Joh. Dist, utr. iur. doc., can. Eistet., 15/3/34

Joh. de Docellis, cur. de Amerul, Tull. dio., presb., 10/6/40

Joh. de Dompnaparia, lic. in decr., 23/11/37

Joh. Douuille, lic. in decr., prep. coll. eccl. s. Petri de Miravalle, Carcasson. dio., 2/9/35

Joh. Drowini, presb. curatus s. Benigni, Medioc., 4/12/39

Joh. Dubet, in leg. lic., 1/37

Joh. Duboc, scol. Venet., lic. in leg., 8/4/40

Joh. Duwer, loco pro ep. Herbipol., 26/7/32

Joh. Efford, bac. in theo., pr. de Folkstan, dio. Cantuari., 26/8/35

mag. Joh. de Eib, can. Eistet., lic. in decr., 15/2/34

Joh. de Eych, can. Eistet., pro cap. Eistet., 6/7/36

Joh. Elcot, decr. doc., 11-12/42

Joh. Eldach, bac. in utr., proc. d. arep. Dublin., ep. Moed., 20/11/33

Ioh. Engen, Susac., Constanci. prep., 1-2/39

mag. Joh. Enyssan, lic. in decr., Trecor. dio., 29/4/40

Joh. de Estalone, bac. in decr., sacrist. eccl. Die. & can Valentin. & s. Bernardi de Romanis, 14/10/35

fr. Joh., pr. mon. b. Marie in Ettel, Frising. dio., 20/11/39

Joh. Ewioz, bac. in decr., thesaurius eccl. Forn. Anglia, 21/10/35

Joh. Eustacii, mag. in art., 23/1/34

Ioh. Fabri, cantor s. Steffani, Maguntin., 1-2/39

Joh. Fager, can. Frinsing., in art. mag., 19/10/36

Joh. Fenant, can. Baioc. et ardiac. Rig., 10/12/34

Joh. Fernandi, bac. in decr., can. Compostell. & Placentin., 14/7/36

Joh. de Ferrariis, monach. et operari. de Nauto o. s. B., Vabr. dio., 25/6/39

fr. Joh. Ferrerii, pr. s. Michaelis o. s. A. can., Vintimili., 10/11/41

fr. Joh. de Ferreriis, pr. de Alsone, Nemau. dio., o. can. reg., 4/2/35

Joh. Figuli, lic. in decr., 15/10/34

Joh. Felioli, in utr. iur. bac., prep. Grass., 13/1/36

mag. Joh. Flabhardi, prep. eccl. Anselzip. Lausan. dio. pro se et cap., 8/8/32

Joh. Flamingi, pro studio Louuani., 23/7/34

Joh. Flackenstein Grandisuallis, dio. Basili. prep., 3/37

Joh. Fluch, 29/4/35

Joh. de Fonte, vic. d. ep. Ambiani., pro et nom. ep. Ambiani., 6/3/32, proc. Ludovic. Scaec, 6/7/32, pro et nom. mandatum ab. s. Fusciani, 11/8/32

Joh. de Fossato, ab. s. Bartholomei Papi., o. s. B., 1/10/34

Joh. de Fossato, s. Stephani de Olzate, Mediolan. prep., 4/37

mag. Joh. Fourfet, can. Maclovi., lic. in decr., 29/4/40

Joh. de Francfordia, mag. in art. pro u. Erford., 23/12/35

fr. Joh. de Franchensteyn, inq. Wratislavi., o. P., 5/6/33

Joh. Frest, mag. in art. et bac. in decr., rect. parr. eccl. de Eageto, Corisopit., 3/7/39

Joh. can. Frinsing., 27/9/32

mag. Joh. de Fruyno, orator d. ducis Burgundie, 10/7/31

fr. Joh. le Furnt, 17/10/33

mag. Joh. de Funo, mag. in theo., prov. Marchie Anconitan., 14/1/34

fr. Joh. de Furno, 17/10/33

mag. Joh. le Galois, can. Rothomag., 17/7/33

Joh. Gasparini de Leocornis, 7/5/34

mag. Joh Gerardi, lic. in leg., sacrist. Aqu., pro d. rege Ludovic. et patria Provinc., 17/4/34

Joh. Ghelz, anglicus, bac. in leg., can. Lubic., proc. d. ep. Bath., Lincoln., & Wingorni., 8/3/32

Joh. Gherowini pro d. Erico et Bernardo, ducibus Saxonie, 21/5/34

Joh. Ghesungen, lic. in decr., 29/10/35

Joh. Ghiebat, can. Ardac., Patavi., 8/8/32

Joh. Gyseler, pleb. eccl. s. Theoderic. minoris, Basili., presb., 18/9/39

Joh. Gilbertus, presb., can. Burgi Vienn., 6/10/33

Joh. Gyll, can. Aberdon., lic. in theo., 14/5/34

Joh. de Godertheim, Francfordi. conventualium, o. M. lector, 1-6/43

Joh. Godin, lic. in theo., pr. priorat. s. Crucis Nannet., o. s. B., pro d. Petro abb. Majoris Monasterii, 26/9/39

fr. Joh. Godini, form. in theo., 8/37

mag. Joh. Goldecer, can. Magdeburg., 22/9/36

fr. Joh. Gornerii, pr. priorat. de Vilariis, Turon. dio., o. Grandimont., 4/3/40

Joh. de Gorselanis, prep. s. Stehpan. in Brolio, Mediolan., 9/3/33

fr. Joh. Gralonis, mag. in theo., o. Cist., 1/7/40

fr. Joh. Greot, pr. priorat. conventualis s. Victor. Leodi. dio., 23/3/36

Joh. Gressi, bac. in decr., 24/4/33

Joh. de Brolia, custos Lugdun., 16/11/36

Joh. Grossi, s. Reyneberti cur., Lugdun., proc. Joh. de Curiis, 17/9/33

Joh. Gruenwalt, mag. in art., can. Embric. dio., Traiect., proc et nom. proc. eiusdem eccl., 4/9/32

Joh. Grummer, rect. parr. eccl. in Mollisheim, Argentin. dio., 1/3/41

Joh. Gulden, rect. parr. eccl. in Brigental, Salczburg. dio., 28/3/38

Joh. Gundissalui, scol. Seguntin., secretarius regis, 22/10/34

Joh. Gutwin, lic. in decr., can. eccl. s. Joh. Maguntin., 19/2/40

Joh. Haicken de Wonsperg, can. eccl. ..., 30/7/40

Joh. Halberger, rect. parr. eccl. in Ranolczberg., Herbipol. dio., can eccl. coll. in Feuchtwanger, August. dio., 3/10/39

Joh. Hamborch, can. eccl. b. Marie ad gradus, Coloni., 15/7/40

Joh. Hamonis, presb., mag. in art. & lic. in decr., rect. eccl. parr. de Pleubauale, Corisopit. dio., 14/10/35

Joh. Harons, mag. in art., can Glasgu., 18/2/35

Joh. Martmanni, can. ss. Crisanti et Darie mon., Eyfle, Coloni. dio., mag. in art., 23/10/39

Joh. Hase, prep. mon. b. Marie Magdalene sub regula s. Augustiniper Alamaniam, 24/4/39

Joh. Hase, presb. rect. parr. eccl. in Frenstorff, Bamberg. dio., in art. bac., 3/10/39

Joh. Haureti, ardiac. Tull., pro cap. Tull. et se ipso, 22/6/36

mag. Joh. Hebardi, can. Merseburg. dio. pro ep., 9/1/33

Joh. Hec, mag. in art. et med., 30/3/36

Joh. Heling, pro ducibus Slesie, 18/3/35

Joh., prep. mon. s. Joh. prope Hequeliam, Maguntin. dio., 29/7/35

Joh. Herdeegen, pastor parr. eccl. in Hasseln, Coloni. dio., 13/5/40

Joh. Hertmann, can. eccl., Herford., 26/8/35

Ioh. Hervei, in decr. lic., 11/38

Joh. de Herwin, rect. parr. eccl. in Buoschoven, Coloni. dio., 1/10/40

Joh. Hesse, lic. in decr., Ratispon. dio., 16/1/33

Joh. Hetteler, alias Wonluelen, can. et scol. eccl. s. Sinaci de Wilestat, Constanci. dio., 29/7/35

Joh. Hymandi, bac. in decr., rect. eccl. parr. de Montoix, Nannet. dio., 12/2/40

Joh. Hirn, dec. eccl. coll. b. Marie virginis in Feutchtwangen, August. dio., 5/6/39

Joh. Hospitis, 2/5/33

Joh. de Hufflet, doc., de o. Premonstratensis, proc. abb. Premonstrat., 6/3/32

Joh. de Huyssechen, alias Heruen, mag. in theo., Parisiensis, 19/3/34

Joh. de Hulsen, rect. eccl. parr. s. Odulrici, Bronswic., Hildesm. dio., 10/9/34

Joh. de Hungaria, pro ep. Quinqueecclesie, 10/12/34

Joh. Hut de Feucht, rect. parr. eccl. de Schonaw, Patavi. dio., 8/7/40

Joh. Jaer, 15/2/34

Joh. Jegir, can. Quinque Ecclesiarum, 2/3/33

Racellus et unos alius pro et nom. mag. gen. o. S. Joh. Jher., 4/12/33

Joh. de Rubo, pro. o. S. Joh. Jher., 19/11/34

Richardus de Windeke, pro commendatore domus Stenvord., o. S. Joh. Monasteri. dio., 27/11/39

Joh. Innelli, mag. in art., dec. eccl. Ross., 3/11/36

mag. Joh. de Insula, prep. Montisfalconis, Rem. dio., 15/3/34

Joh. Jobaudi, presb. rect. parr. eccl. de Varonna. Maclovi. dio., 14/10/35

Joh. Joberti, ardiac. Lingon., 22/5/33

Joh. Jonher, Colon., 10/37

Joh. Josselini, ardiac. in eccl. Constanci., 20/11/33

Joh. Jourdani, causarum proc., 28/3/38

Joh. Yuerduno, mag. hosp. s. Spiritus, Tul., 2/37

fr. Joh. de Juys, pr. prioratus de Monteto, o. s. B., Bituric. dio., 23/12/35

Joh. Keck de Monaco, Frising., dio., mag. in art. et bac. in theo., 24/3/41

Joh. Kempener, pro officio cursoris, 15/10/34

fr. Joh. Kerghus, nobilis ex utr. parente, capel. ill. d. Petri Britanie, filii secundo geniti serenissimi d. ducis Brittannie, 18/9/39

Joh. Kerkof, lit. apost. abbr., prep. Mind., 12/6/39

Joh. Krelaert, rect. eccl. parr. de Weseren, Leodi. dio., 29/1/40

Joh. Lamberti, alias Wyllebrodi, d. nostri pape cursor, 5/3/34

Joh. Lamelin, can. Tornac., lic. in decr., amb. d. Burgundie et pro se ipso, 1/10/34

Joh. de Lantenay, can. Lausan., amb. ducis Sabaudie, 7/8/33

Joh. Lapicida de Konnegeshofen, mag. in art., studens univ. Wiennensis per quatuor annos in jure canonico, 3/10/39

mag. Joh. Lauantaige, prep. Insul. et tamquam amb. d. ducis Burgundie, 14/1/35

fr. Joh. Ledenis, pr. de Mirabello, o. s. Aug., Lingon. dio., pro ab. S. Stephani de Divione, 26/7/32

mag. Joh. Leodegarii, proc. causarum in curia Romana, can. Rothomag., 13/11/33

Joh. Leonis, decr. doc., 29/11/32

fr. Joh. ab. de Lerez, proc. arep. et aliquorum prelatorum provincie Compostellane, 22/10/34

Joh. Lerpach, prep. can. reg. in Werthen, Constanc., 1/37

Joh. Lescle, in. decr. lic., Corisopit. dio., 29/4/40

Joh. de Lila, presb. cur. de Benay, Lausan. dio., 29/4/40

Joh. de Liserio, can. Sedun., 23/11/39

Joh. Lisman, can. eccl. s. Crucis Nortus., rect. parr. eccl. in Busungen, Maguntin. dio., 10/7/39

Joh. de Lisura, decr. doc., 27/5/32

Joh. Lobestyn, Lubic. et Missin. eccl. can, mag. in art. et bac. in decr., 3/11/36

Joh. Loheir, nom. d. ..., 6/4/33

proc. Joh. Lond., arep., 12/37

Joh. Lopey, mag. in art., Paris., Cenoman. dio., 18/12

fr. Joh. de Lorich, precept. s. Anthonii de Rossestorff, dio. Maguntin., 18/9/33

Joh. de Lovania, proc. Ludo. Scaec, 6/7/32

Joh. Lupi, in theo. mag. et sedis apost. capel., 29/11/32

Joh. de Maclavis, decr. doc., Lausan. et Vercell. eccl. cath. can., 3/11/41

Joh. Magilheuch, prep. eccl. de Linioden, 8/2/34

Joh. Maginati, cur. Meriaci, Lugdun. dio., presb., 20/5/40

Joh. Mancz, can. in eccl. Basil., presb., 7/8/39

Joh. Mansonis, dec. eccl. s. Martini, Monasteri., 13/11/33

Joh. Marie, off. Bisuntin., 18/3/35

Joh. Marsissiiplana, can. eccl. Barchinon., de nobili genere procreatus, 6/10/41

Joh. Martini, mag. in art., Baioc. dio., 3/2/33

Joh. Martini, thes. et can. Baioc., 11/3/35

Joh. Martini de Drias, can. eccl. Burg., 14/5/35

Joh. Martini, cap. d. card. s. Petri. proc. nom fr. de Belforate, ab s. Zoili de Cardione, o.s.B., Palentine dio., 3/11/36

Ioh. Martini, bac. in utr., 1-2/42

Joh. Maselli, pr. de Albagnico, Ruth. dio., 16/3/36

fr. Joh. Ozed, o.s.B., proc. ab. s. Joh. de Matheno, iuxta Persium, dio. Castelle, 6/6/32

Joh. Mathy, pr. priorat. b. M. de Falcono, o.s.B., Ebredun. dio., 17/3/41

Joh. Mauricii, pr. de Mostrolio, Andegav. dio., 11/2/35

Joh. Mechlinghen, dec. eccl. Onnispic., 5/3/34

Joh. de Meci, presb. Suession. dio., rect. s. Ant. et beneficiat. in eccl. cath Tarentasi., familiaris arep., 4/12/39

Joh. de Mecora, can. Tarentasi. et Gebenn., 3/2/36

Joh., prep. Mecovi., 16/10/33

fr. Joh. de Medialano, 23/2/33

Joh. de Medina, cant. Salamantin., in personam mag. Joh. Alfonsi de Zegobia, 4/11/33

Joh. Meigneron, capel. s. Crucis, Pontis Moncionis, 14/1/34

Joh. Meylenhuit, alias de Canibus, porterius porte ferri, 13/11/33

mag. Joh. Mekes, proc. arep. Rig. et ep. Tarbat., 5/5/33

Joh. de Meldico, o.s.B., Patavi. dio., 21/5/34

Ioh. Melnes, in decr. lic., 3/39

Joh. Mencz, rect. parr. eccl. in Lobedag, Nuemberg. dio., presb., 3/10/39

Joh. de Menis personatus, 10/37

Joh. Mer, 5/5/33

Ioh. de Merback, elect. confirm. mon. Averbodi. Premonst., Leodi. dio., 3-5/42

Joh. Mercandi, can. Maurian., bac. in decr., 26/10/39

mag. Joh. Mercerii, 22/5/33

Joh. Mercerii de Villa Fereos, porcionarius in eccl. Palentin., capel. d. s. Petri card., 30/3/36

Joh. Merhelscheyt, dec. eccl. coll. in Bilberch, Trever. dio., 29/5/39

Joh., capel. d. ep. Met., 2/4/34

Joh. de Meulant, rect. eccl. parr. in Guekmarken, dio. Traiect., in art. mag., 1/7/40

Joh., ab. mon. s. Michaelis de Clusa, Taurin. dio. decr. doc., 23/10/39

Joh. Mileti, pr. s. Joberti, Gracionopolitan. dio., 2/3/36

mag. Joh. Milinchus, dec. eccl. coll. Assind., Coloni. dio., 29/5/39

Joh. Millinchus, can. eccl. coll. s. Patrocli, Susaci. Coloni. dio., 13/5/40

Joh. Moncheti, in utr. lic., ab., 5/37

Joh. de Montabor, decr. doc., o. Pruten. in Herbipol., 23/2/33

fr. Joh. de Montecavato, precept. s. Ant. de Reversio, Taurin. dio., 23/10/39

mag. Joh. de Montemartis, proc. ep. et cleri Wormac., 1/32

Joh. de Montenoison, mag. in theo., ut proc. ab. Cluni., pr. de Mantala, 31/5/32
-pro se, 2/5/33

Joh. Monzach, 27/3/34

Joh. Morosiy, dec. eccl. Avinion., 26/9/32

Joh. de Mulbrun, 2/6/32

Joh. de Mutonibus, pro cap. eccl. Tarusin., 9/4/34

Guido Karkoent, lic. in utr. iur., pro Joh. de Nandillac, ardiac. de Pago Casella, in eccl. Tarracon., 7/8/39

Ioh. Natalis, in utr. bac., 8/38

Joh. Nicolai, dec. Tull., proc. Ludov. Scaec, 6/7/32

Joh. Nicolai, utr. iur. bac., can. Urgell., 16/10/39

Joh. Nicolai, utr. iur. doc., 11-12/42

Joh. Nyder, pr. Predicatorum, Basili., 4/3/32

fr. Joh. Nobilis, o.A., 8/7/35

Joh. Nogera, succentor Gerund., 8/37

fr. Joh. Noize, pr. priorat. Leonis Montis, Tull. dio., lic. in decr., nom. proc. r. p. d. Valentini, ab. Mudiani mon. dicte dio., 15/7/40

Joh. Norbeck, 6/6/32

Joh. Normant, mag. in art. et bac. in leg., 24/4/33

mag. Joh. Norwic, art. et med. doc., diac. Traiect. dio., 7/9/36

Joh., ab. mon. de Novocastro, o. Cist., Argentin. dio., 14/11/32

Joh. de Odegre, dec. s. Martini, Wesali., 5/3/34

Joh. de Odeur, mag. in art. et bac. in leg., can s. Martini, Leodi., 23/7/34

Joh. Olive, cant. eccl. Abrinc., mag. in art., 10/12/34

fr. Joh. Ozede, o.s.B., proc. ab. s. Joh. Matheno iuxta Persium, dio. Castelle, 6/6/32

mag. Joh. Pachi, provincialis prov. Provinci., o. Carm., mag. in theo., 6/6/32

Joh., capell. d. Paduan., 11/3/35

Joh. de Palomar, utr. iur. doc., sacr. palacii auditorem, 19/7/31

Joh. de Palude, pr. Paterniaci, o. Clun, 2/10/33
Petrus de Trillia, inc. in proc. pro et nom. d. Joh. de Palude, 9/2/33

Joh. Paraprach, secr. d. ducis Bavaris, rect. parr. eccl. in Langinghen, Argentin. dio., 16/11/36

Joh. Pascalis, pleb. s. Agethe et can. Concordi., 30/4/34

Joh. Passart, pr. o. can. reg. in Traiecto, pro d. ep. Traiect. et nom proprio, 21/8/32

Joh. de Patavia, mag. in art., studii Vien., subdiac., 27/5/40

Joh. Paulani, professus mon. Ebrac., bac. in theo. pro d. abbate eiusdem mon., 23/3/36

Joh. Pentelinck, can. eccl. cath., Monasteri. et Paderburn., nobilis ex utr. parente, 22/5/39

Joh., amb. comitis Perdriaci, 29/4/35

mag. Joh. Peregallus, pro ab. s. Petri in Celo Aureo, Papi., o.s.A., 28/9/36

Joh. Perieti Nycossiensis, serviens armorum nostro d. pape, 24/4/34

Joh. de Perpiniano, in utr. iur. bac., 6/37

Joh. de Perreria, dec. Senon., 17/4/33

Joh. de Petraconia, prep. s. Petri, Aquilegi. dio., 9-10/42

Joh. Philippi, theo. prof., o. Carm., 18/2/35

Joh. Pinarii, 27/8/34

Joh. Pladlieger, cur. parr. eccl. in Matray, Brixin., 27/9/33

Joh. Platelli, Sagi. gardianus, 1-6/43

Joh. Plomenselech, mag. in art. et lic. in decr., 14/5/34

Joh. mag. in art. et bac. in decr., cantor et can. s. Andree, Coloni., pro se ipso et ep. Ploc., 14/5/35

Joh. Pollart, proc. prep. eccl. s. Spiritus Ruremundus, Leodi. dio., nom. proprio, 27/6/39

Joh., ab. de Pomeriis, o. Cist., Argentin. dio., 6/2/40

Joh. de Posa, 4/6/34

Joh. de Pratis, bac. in theo., 12/6/34

mag. Joh. Prepositi, in decr. lic., 18/8/36

Joh. Prese, lic. in leg., 6/7/36

Joh. Probstlin, vic., 27/3/39

Joh. Publini, mag. studencium in theo., conv. Argentin., o.M., 28/7/41

Joh. Pulchripatris, mag. in theo., amb. u. Paris., 23/7/31

Joh. Puschlo, mag. in art. et bac. in decr., 8/4/35 mag. Joh. Quelden, proc. cleri Constanci., 13/6/32

Joh. de Quenneyo, mag. in theo., Paris., 17/9/34

mag. Joh. Quentin, lic. in leg., adm. per dd. deputatos pro d. ep. Sagi., 12/8/35

Joh. de Quesneyo, rect. eccl. parr. s. Laurencii de Polenswilre, Sagi. dio., 29/1/40

Ioh. ex marchion. Romagnani, in decr. lic., 1-2/42

Joh. de Ragusa, o.P., mag. theo., proc. o., 21/4/31

Joh. Rap, decr. doc., can. Zurzac., 3/11/36

Joh. de Rascon., s. Fidelis Cuman., prep., 4/37

Joh. de Ravenitis, proc. ab. Clarevall., Mediolan. dio., o. Cist., 7/9/33

fr. Joh. Reginaldi, monachus, professus, elemosinarius, ac proc. mon. s. Simphoriani extra muros Met., o.s.B., 13/11/39

mag. Joh. Relier, rect. parr. eccl. Monsterii in Taratensi., scriptor in registro bullarum, 9/6/41

Joh. de Reno, can. Tridentin., rect. parr. in Reno, Tridentin. dio., 1/7/40

Joh. Retre, prebend. eccl. Daer, 3/12/34

mag. Joh. Riberselli, can. Capnone pro cap., 16/1/34

Joh. Richemont, lic. in decr., mag. in art., 27/6/39

Franciscus Columbi et Joh Rikossen, pro scol. Spir., 1/12/36

Joh. Robertus, Mallerbe, 7/11/32

Joh. Rocsonal, can. Bardewic., 7/8/39

Pet. de Trillia, decr. doc., ardiac. Lodov., 6/8/32
-produxit mandatus pro et nom. d. Joh. de Rocozello, can. eccl. Lodov., pr. eccl. ruralis s. Martini de Celhesio, Bitter., 9/2/33

Joh. Rode, nom. proprio, 16/1/34

mag. Joh. Roden, pro ardiac. Hildesmen., 30/7/34

Joh. Roden, pro cap. Trident., 28/9/36

Joh. Rodenheim, 31/8/33

Joh. de Romali, 9/2/33

Joh. de Ronuceyo, mag. in theo., can. Bituric., pro cap. Bituric. et ep. Anici., 4/11/33

mag. Joh. Rosen, in decr. lic., can. s. Katherine prope Aquisbellere, tamquam proc. et eciam nom. proprio., 27/11/39

Joh. Rouselli, pro ab. de Corbeya, 4/7/32

Joh. Rouselli, 23/9/33

Joh. de Rubo, pro o. s. Joh. Jher., 19/11/34

Joh. de Rupella-Liura, bac. in decr., pr. secular. s. Marcialis de Govriaco, Ruthen. dio., 4/3/40

mag. Joh. Rostoch, dec. ss. Petri et Michailis, Argentin., 26/1/33

Ioh. Sacrist, in utr. doc., 11/38

Joh. Saelder, 29/2/32

Joh. de Sagobia, in sac. pag. doc., pro Fernando, arep. Brachar., 7/8/36

Joh. Alfonsi de Zagobia, doc. in theo., 8/4/33
mag. Joh. de Zagobia, proc. d. Petri de Boccanegra, dec. Conch., consilliari regis Castelle, 7/10/33
Joh. de Medina, cant. Salamant. in personam mag. Joh. Alfonsi de Zegobia, 4/11/33
Joh. Alfonsi, doc. in sac. pag., pro u. Salamantin., 27/8/34

Joh. de la Sala, religiosus o.s.B., operarius mon. Conch. et pr. de Regniaco, Ruthen. dio., 13/11/39

mag. Joh. de Sallione, 30/3/33

Joh. Salomon. precentor, servarie, dio. Vic. presb., 15/5/39

Joh. Salvatoris, in utr. iur. bac., 18/8/36

Joh. Salvatoris, 25/8/36

Joh. Sanageti. bac. in decr., 27/5/40

Ioh. de s. Clemente, in decr. lic., 1-2/39

Joh. de Sannam, proc. ep. Swerin. et ep. Rasborg., 2/8/31

Joh. Sanxii de Friez, 3/9/34

Joh. Sarnier, mag. in art., presb. rect. parr. eccl. in Wyden, Ratispon. dio., 31/7/39

Joh. de Sauguyse, lic. in decr., can. infirmarius eccl., Montisarragonum, 9/5/39

Joh. de Scadeck, mag. in art., can. et vicecustos eccl. coll. b. Marie Sandemiri. Cracovi. dio., 23/6/41

Joh. Scallerman, sacr. palacii causarum apost. auditor, 11/2/32
-ep. Gurc., 16/11/33

Joh., ab. in Scattern Argentin. dio., 11/9/35

Joh. Schaden, vic. altar. s. Joh. ewangeliste in Keppel, Traiect. dio., bac. in art., Parisi., 15/7/40

Joh. Schaltenbrant, rect., eccl. parr. in Rotersdorff, Basili. dio., cap. perpetuus eccl. Basili., 12/6/39

Joh. Schanck, rect. parr. eccl. in Hamelstat, Bamberg. dio., cancellarius, d. ep. Bamberg., 5/6/39

Joh. Scultbas, in Snackenburg, Verden., prep., 4/37

fr. Joh. Segalas, conmendator s. Bartholomei, Gerund., 1-2/39

Joh. Seghardi, presb. rect. parr. eccl. de Austrecourt, bac. in decr., Attrebat. dio., 21/8/34

Joh. Selburch, cur. in Perona, o. Teut., et mag. Theoderic. Nagel, can. eccl. Rig., pro mag. dicti o. per Livoniam, 2/1/40

Joh., ab. Selz., 29/10/34

Ioh. Senterii, in decr. lic., 7/38

Joh. de Seracusis, o.M., in theo. bac. 9-10/42

Joh. Serragossa, rect. parr. eccl. de Beirganimi, Valentin. dio., 22/4/40

Joh. de s. Severino, prep., Anici., proc. comitis de Villariis, 30/6/33

fr. Joh. Siegelholtz, precept. de Friburgo, o.s.Joh. Jher., 17/10/32

Joh. de Silva, vexillifer maior, prefali d. regis Castelle, 22/10/34

Ioh. Syme, thes. Cathilin., 11/38

mag. Joh. Slaczenrois, promotor sacr. concilii nom. proc. d. Stephani Behem, prep. eccl. b. Marie in Scurtad extra muros Bamberg., 3/11/41

Joh. Slechenrode, can. b. Marie extra muros Bamberg., 10/2/36

Joh. Slizenroid, promotor sacr. concilii, nom. proc. d. Bernardi de Galen, in art. mag. it in sacr. pag. lic., can. Leodi. et rect. parr. eccl. in Yselmuden, Traject. dio., 23/6/41

Joh. Solennes, secrista secundus, mon. Rivopulli, Vic. dio., 4/3/40

Joh. Soucherii, mag. in theo., o.M., 13/8/34

Joh. Spaserii, pro d. Audeberto, prothonotario de Petra, 6/7/36
mag. Joh. Spasserii pro d. ep Laudun., 4/6/34
Joh Spasserii, pro ep Vauri., 7/4/35
Joh. Spazerii, bac. in decr., 11/8/33

Joh., ab. Stafarde, o. Cist. Tauri. dio., 26/10/39

mag. Joh. de Stampis, lic. in leg., cant. eccl. Bituric., pro cap., 2/4/33

Joh. Startz, rect. eccl. in Munster, Herbipol. dio., 18/12/39

Joh. Steinbron, in decr. lic., 8/37

Joh. Steinmetz, can. eccl. s. Joh. extra muros Herbipol., cleric., 16/10/39

Joh. Stelelmeyer, can. eccl. coll. s. Andree intra et extra muros Frising., 15/5/39

Joh. Stretbergher, cur. in Panden, 8/8/32

Joh. Striganelli, in decr. lic., rect. eccl. parr. de Vertano, Nannet. dio., 29/4/40

Joh. Suabech, capel arep. Maguntin, amb. arep. Maguntin., can. Francford., 17/3/33

Joh. Suderen, rect. eccl. parr. in Lienach, Herbipol. dio., 5/6/39

ab. mon. s. Joh. de Suidua, o.s.B., Aqu. dio., 4/2/35

Joh. Suseler, can. Daventri., Traiect. dio., 28/11/32

Joh. Swert de Monasterio, in decr. lic., pro d. Maguntin. moderno, 3/2/36

Joh. Suevin., can. s. Thome, Argentin., 13/11/33

Joh., ab. Suspini, Bellic. dio., o. Cist., 26/10/39

Joh. Ternehowe, dec. Trauemburg., Coloni. dio., 9/37

Joh. Textoris, lic. in decr., elemosinarus eccl. Avinion., 14/7/36

Ioh. Textoris, s. Petri Basil., custos, 7/38

Joh. Then, rect. parr. eccl. de Queberoen et pr. priorat. secularis et administrator hospitalis b. Marie de Alrayo, Venet., 27/5/40

Joh. de Thenen, decr. doc., ep. Bamberg., 27/6/32

fr. Joh., o. b. Marie Theutonicorum, 3/9/34

mag. Joh. Tinelli, pro arep. Thosolano, 16/4/34

fr. Joh. de Tingonne, pr. Belne Edu. dio., o.s.B., 8/7/35

mag. Joh. Tongheris, lic. in med., 25/6/34

Joh. Tornerii, presb. beneficiatus in eccl. b. Marie de Regali, ville Perpiniani, Eln. dio., 31/7/39

Joh. Torrandi, in decr. lic., 3/37

Joh. Toudontin, can. eccl., Maurin., bac. in decr., 2/11/39

Joh. Turk, capel. eccl., Basil., 16/1/34

Joh. Turrandi, in decr. lic., can. eccl. s. Salvatoris de Yrissione, Bituric. dio., 8/7/35

Ioh. de Turno, in decr. lic., 3/39

Joh. de Turricella, bac. in utr., 3/37

Joh. Tzeuwelghien, lic. in leg., prep. eccl. s. Andree, Colon. dio., 19/2/40

Joh. de Vado, 17/4/33

Joh. Vallasci, qui per sex annos studuit in Studio Salamantino in iure canonico, rect. parr. eccl. Pauolini, Vis. dio., familiaris r. p. d. ep. Vis., 24/7/39

mag. Joh. de Valle, off. Nic., pro se et ep. Nici., 4/7/32

Joh. de Valle, doc. in theo., rect. parr. eccl. de Plebeneor, Leon. dio., 16/10/39

fr. Joh. de Valereyo, pr. priorat. de Relangiis, o. Cluni., Tull. dio., nobilis, 28/11/39

Joh. de Vatent, can. Utic., 3/2/33

Joh. Weghennere, cur. parr. eccl. s. Joh. in Frer, dio. Sleswic., proc. ep. et cap. Sleswic., 2/8/32

Joh. Veyse, lic. in decr., 9/37

Joh. Werini, pro et nom. cap. Met., 20/1/33

Joh. de Vernolo, bac. in decr., 2/1/34

Joh. de Westernach, Stockardi, Constanc., 6/37

Joh. Wetin, lic. in decr., 20/7/36

Joh. de Wette, Hispanus, cliens armorum d. nostri pape, 10/3/33

Ioh. Vetter, s. Iacobi in Keyserburg, Maguntin., 7/38

Joh., ab. mon. ss. Victoris et Constancii, o.s.B., Taurin., 26/10/39

Joh. de Wydenrode, can. cath. Prag. et Olocum. eccl., 2/9/35

Joh. Villa, can. eccl. coll. s. Joh., ville Perpiniani, Eln. dio., 25/2/41

Ioh. Willekin, custos Lympurg, Trever., 12/38

Joh. de Villone, can. Met., 16/9/35

mag. Joh. Wilstergo, Vormaci., pro ep. Vormaci. et nom. proprio, 5/5/33

Joh. Wymcester, can. Moravi., 15/12/32

Ioh. de Violardis, s. Ioh. Montis Cinerum, Novari. precept., 3-5/42

fr. Joh. Wypennim, o. A., bac. formata in theo., proc. d. ep. Elph., 20/11/33

Joh. Vischdom, rect. parr. eccl. in Wisgrien, perpetuus vic. in eccl. Basili., 24/4/39

Joh. de Wisenheim, mag. domus s. Spiritus, Wormaci., 23/4/40

Joh. Wiss de Eckle, presb. rect. parr. eccl. in Walpach, Constanci. dio., 25/7/39

Joh. Wysz, mag. in art. et bac. in theo., 3/6/40

mag. Joh. de Vitriaco, can. Rem., 12/2/34

fr. Joh. Vitten, pr. mon. s. Egidii in Bruswic, o.s.B., Halberstad. dio., 14/10/35

mag. Joh. Viviani, 25/9/33

Joh. Voiz, Trev. dio., 24/3/32

Joh. de Vraumbergh, Trev. dio., 24/3/32

Joh. Zoens, can. eccl. ss. Cristanti et Darii, opidi mon. Eifflie, Colon. dio., 6/2/40

Joh. Zoermont, art. et decr. doc., pro ep. Traiect., 21/8/32

Joh., doc. in theo., u. Wien., nuncius ducis Albertus Austrie, proc. u. Wien., 5/7/32

Joh. Durcuilden, 22/8/32

Joh. de Spira, o.s.A., Bellic. dio., 22/8/32

Jordanus Gauareti, 26/8/35

Jordanus Morinus, amb. regis Francie, electus Silvanet., 12/12/32

pr. s. Ypoliti, Ruthen. dio., 14/5/34

Pet. de Lanneto, proc. ep. Ipori., pro ep. et cap., 19/12/32

Pet. de Porres, ardiac. de Camazes, proc. d. arep. Ipsal., 22/10/34

Judocus Conet. dec. eccl. coll. s. Germani in Monte Hanonie, 26/11/34

mag. Joh. Thome de Melios, 8/2/34

Judocus Keseler, can. eccl. s. Jacobi extra muros Bamberg. et rect. parr. eccl. in Eringen, Patavi. dio., 3/10/39

Judocus Quadraw, o. Theutonicorum, 10/12/34

Judocus de Ponte, serviens armorum cum d. Arelat., 4/6/34

Judocus de Stoippen, plebanus in Hirsenghen, Basil. dio., presb., 17/6/40

fr. Ypolitus de Cunis, doc. in theo. et decr., o.M., 9/4/34

proc. Pet., Yporregi. ep., 10/38

Ysidorus de Rosate, decr. doc. pro se et ab. s. Petri in Celo Aureo, Papi. dio., 28/11/32

Iulianus Longour, in utr. bac., 12/38

Yvo Amorosii, Maclovi. dio., bac. utr. iur., capel. capellanie b. Catherine in eccl. coll. de Gurrandia, 8/7/40

Yuo Anahubo, can. eccl. coll. s. Felicis de Catane, 10/12/34

Yvo Androlec, rect. parr. eccl. Trelevern, Trecor. dio., bac. in leg., 24/3/41

fr. Yvo de Bolloforti, pr. priorat. b. Marie Bellarum Vallium, o. Cluni., Gebenn. dio., bac. in decr., 3/11/41

fr. Yuo de Gruuy, pro ab. Rothomensi., Venet. dio., 16/4/34

fr. Yuo Hueti, o.M. de observancia, Venet., conv. Lavallis guidonis, Cenoman. dio., 14/10/35

Yvo Johannuw, in utr. iur. bac., rect. parr, eccl. de Plebeparva, Trecor. dio., 29/4/40

Yuo de Kaerchenc, lic. in leg., can. et off. Leon., de nobili genere ex utr. parente procreatus, 8/6/36

Yvo Lemi, can. Leon. in leg. lic., 6/4/40

fr. Yvo le Long, in decr. lic., pr. priorat. ... nom. proprio, 5/10/39

Yvo Mauri, leg. doc., ardiac. de Lata in eccl. Burg., 4/11/33

Yvo de Menez, nobilis ex utr. parente, rect. parr. eccl. de Tregastel, dio. Trecor., 20/6/39

Yvo. Roberti, rect. parr. eccl. de Morac, Venet. dio., secr. d. ducus Britanie, 27/5/40

Yvo Tammic, presb. dio. Tarrcon., rect. parr. eccl. de Maël, Corisopit. dio., 7/8/39

Yvo Taurinet, rect. eccl. parr. de Mathocolio, Nannet. dio., 23/12/39

fr. Yuo, provincialis prov. Turon., o.M., 31/8/33

Yvo Vulpis, lic. in leg., can. Trecor., 23/7/40

ab. s. Eugendi, Jur. Legdun. dio., amb. ducis Burgundie, 26/5/33

Franc. de Pistorio, presb. Quiri., decr. doc., Turin. dio., pro ab. s. Justi de Secusia, 2/10/33

ab. s. Justine de Sessadio, dio. Aqu., 2/10/33

ep. Justopolitan., 13/4/33 (Franciscus de Florentia, o.P.)

Karolus de Edlemeghe de Terusio, leg. doc., 1/10/34

Karolus de Hubertis, ardiac. Mantua., 29/5/33

Karolus Mackardi, clericus Lud., scriptor lit. penitenciarie, 1/7/40

ab. Lacus Iuri., N. de Sabaudia, o. Premonst., 18/6/32

ab. s. Lamberti, dio. Salzburg., 1/5/33

proc. ep. Laventin., tam in nom. ipsius ep. quam ab. L. Lamberti, 5/19/32

Lambertus Brune de Cluppelberg, rect. parr. eccl. in Heymersheim, Colon. dio., bac. in art., 17/4/39

Lambertus Dantin, prep. s. Dyonisii, Leodi., decr. doc., 23/7/34

Lambertus de Reyss, vic. eccl. b. Marie Rec., in leg. lic., 2/1/40

Lambertus Vagner, can. eccl. Misn., decr. doc., 12/11/35

mag. Lambertus Vlieger, b. Marie Traiect., pro d. Ludo., 13/8/34

ab. de Lanken, 29/2/32

ab. s. Petri de Laude, 14/3/32

ep. Laud., 14/3/32 (Gerardus; Capitani de Landriano)

mag. Jac. de Attignaco, utr. iur. doc., can. Rem. nom. suo proprio, 24/4/33
-adm. est pro cap. Laudun., 13/6/33

mag. Joh. Spasserii, pro d. ep. Laudun., 4/6/34

mag. Petrus Textoris, lic. in decr., capel. s. Petri, Basil., proc. ep. Laventin., 12/2/34

proc. ep. Laventini, tam in nom. ipsius ep. quam ab. L. Lamberti, 5/19/32

Laur. Lauentine, ep., 10/37 (Laur. de Lichtenberg)

fr. Laur., o.s. Trinitatis, proc. o. ss. Martirium de regno Polonie, 24/7/32

mag. Laur. le Berruier, dec. Baioc., 10/12/34

Laur. Hamman, rect. parr. eccl. in Prutz, Brixin, dio., 21/7/41

Laur. Hollender, presb. rect. parr. eccl. in Gusten, Colon. dio., 18/3/40

fr. Laur. de Nuemberga, professus monasterii Sublac. ad specus Tiburtine, dio. o.s.B., 1/7/40

Laur. Olerii, beneficiatus in eccl. Insule, Eln. dio., presb., 13/11/39

fr. Laur. de Orlandis, pr. Urbis, o.s. Joh. Jher., 13/11/33

Laur. Perskant, bac. in leg., de nobili genere procreatus, rect. parr. eccl. de Plebesizin, Leon. dio., 10/6/40

fr. Laur. de Pisis, inq. Bononi., 3/5/33

Joh. Rothomag., card. Rothomag., tit. s. Laur. in Lucia, 17/4/33

mag. Laur. de Rotella, 16/5/32

Laur. de Rotella pro ep. Tricaric., 21/8/34

Laur. Sacpulac, o. fr. Predicatorum, in sacra theo. lic., 14/8/39

Laur., ab. mon. b. Marie de Solsono, o. s. A., Urgell. dio., 31/7/39

Ludo. de Palude, ep. Lausan., 1/32

Ioannes de Bringino, Lausan. ep., 10/38 (Ioannes de Pragino)

prep. Lausan., 2/10/33

pr. s. Simplicii inter Lausan. et Gebenn., o.s.B., 26/10/39

Lazarus de Langimano, arpresb. de Lacabana, Parm. dio., 8/38

Lazarus de Lipora, pro ab. s. Bartholomei de Fossato, o. Vallisumbrose, Janu. dio., 25/9/33

Garsias Martini de Vaamonde, ardiac. de Reyna, proc. d. ep. Legion., 22/10/34

Lemovic. dio., prep., 3/38

Leobing Padiolean, rect. parr. eccl. s. Germani de Princeyo, Lucio. dio., in utr. iur. bac., 23/4/40

Leobinus de Padiolan, rect. parr. eccl. s. Germani de Princeyo (Lucio.) dio., bac. in utr., 8/4/40

fr. Leode de Dura, mag. in theo., 25/5/33

Paulus Ghiesquiere, bac. in theo., o. Valliscolarium de Montibus in Hasnonia, pro prioribus existentibus in dio. Leodi., 15/10/34

mag. Leonardus de Cremona, o. M., 24/7/32

Leon. Greve, pleb. eccl. s. Leonardi, Basil., 29/1/40

Leonardus Kolner, rect. parr. eccl. b. Virginis in Kirpuchill, Salzburg. dio., presb., 15/5/39

mag. Leonardus Michaelis, can. eccl. s. Martini de Darpena, Coloni. dio., 23/10/39

Leonardus de Stamatis, s. Marie de Ianua, o. Humiliatorum, 9/38

ep. Leon., 13/4/33 (Joannes Pregent)

Oliverius Cauer, proc. cap. cath. eccl. Leon., 15/4/40

Leonhardus Wackerfeld, can. eccl. cath. Mind. presb., 12/6/39

Leopardus Vizere, subdiac., can. Nivern., 9/10/39

ab. de Lerne, 10/7/33

ep. Lession., 15/3/34 (Nic. Tartagli)

ep. Lexovi., prov. Rothomag., amb. regis Anglie, 11/7/32 -amb. regis Francie, 17/12/36

Joh. Dieulfist, pro cap. Lexovi., 11/2/35

Liebhardus Swalb de Benedictenbeyeren, lic. in med. et mag. in art., 15/7/40

Joh. Ghelz, Anglicus, bac. in leg., can. in Lubic., proc. de. Bathon., Lincoln., Wigorn., 8/3/32

Joh. Archerii, mag. in theo., pro et nom. ep. Lingon., 21/11/32

Petrus de Brena, cantor eccl. Lingon., pro mag. Joh. Govillon electo in ep. Lingon., 17/4/34

Egidius de Argentolis, can. Lingon., pro cap. Lingon., 3/2/33

Lodolphus, ab. mon. in Flettorf, o.s.B., Padeburn. dio., 7/9/36 ab. Bone Vallis, pro ab. s. Guillermide Deserto, Lodov., 24/4/34

Berengarius Masaudi, bac., camerarius mon. s. Salvatoris civitatis Lodov., pro d. ab. eiusdem mon., 9/3/36

Petrus de Trillia, decr. doc., ardiac. Lodov., 6/8/32
-pro ep. Lodov. et pro se ipso, 12/9/32

Lodovic. Peresii, in decr. lic., 10/38

Provincialis Lombardie, o.P., 18/7/32

presidens monasteriorum reformatorum, o.s.B., in Lombardia, 1/38

proc. Joh., Lond. arep., 12/37

ab. de Longonio, Corisopit. dio., 3/7/34

pr. quidam de Lotharingia, o.s.B., 26/2/32

Joh. Flamingi, pro Studio Louvani., 23/7/34

Hebrardus de Lippio, prof. theo., proc ep., prep. dec., et cap., Lubic., 2/8/32

Hen. Tock, can. Magdeburg., dec. Ratispon., proc. ep. Lubic., 13/9/32

ep. Lubic., 19/6/33 (Joannes Schele)

Petrus, decr. doc., pro u. Lubic., 3/37

scol. Lubic., 17/10/33

Joh. Balcheber, in decr. lic., r. p. eccl. de Vallibur, Tarracon. dio., per proc., videlicet d. Lucam Roures, rect. eccl. s. Vincencii, Valentin., 26/1/40

Luca de Senis, mag. in theo., o. M., inq. Marsie Trivisane, 26/8/35

Lucas Boures, Terdon. precentor., 7/38

Stephanus de Cassis de Novuria, leg. doc., 9/4/32
-adm. et inc. pro et nom. ab. s. Salvatoris de Exeto, Lucane, 31/8/33

Lucas, arpresb. Ymol., lic. in decr., 5/3/34

Lucas Juliano, mag. in art., 16/1/33

Lucas Schaudorff, decr. doc., 11-12/42

Lucas de Tyleto, o. Cist., Aqu. dio., ab., 11-12/42

ab. Lucell., o. Cist., 11/4/32

Michael de Melino, ardiac. de Baessa in eccl. Gienensi, pro et nom. ep. Luc., 25/9/33

prep. Lucern., o.s.B., 1/3/32

Luchinus de Dona, dio. Cuma., ab., 4/37

Lucianus de Senk, proc. Ludov. Scaec, 6/7/32

Lucidus Petri, decr. doc., pro cap. Paduano, 30/4/34

Guido de Vercellis, pro ep. Lucion., Lucion., 15/10/34

Ludolphus, thes. Ozeli. pro ep. Ozili., 23/1/34

Ludolphus de Hasberg, can. Hernsemerg., nobilis, cur. parr. eccl. in Winterswiter, dio. Hernsemerg., 27/1/36

mag. Lambertus Vlieger, b. Marie Traiect., pro d. Ludo., 13/8/34

Willermus Paedre, mag., pro d. Ludo., 13/8/34

mag. Joh. Gerardi, lic. in leg., sacrista Aqu., pro d. rege Ludo. et Patria Provincie, 17/4/34

card. Arelat., 4/6/34, Ludo. de Alemannus

Ludo. Alvari de Paz, leg. doc., pro rege Castelle, 22/10/34

Ludo. de conventu fratrum Minorum, s. Audomar., 2/4/32

Ludo., comes de Verten, prep. eccl. s. Stephani, Bamberg., 12/11/35

mag. Thom. Francisci, pro mag. Ludo. de Borreya, dec. eccl. Baioc., 9/4/34

Ludo., rect. eccl. de Budirsa, 15/2/34

mag. Ludo. de Garsiis, 22/5/33

Ludo. Gundissalui, can. Legion., proc. d. ep. Ouev., 22/10/34

Ludo. Gundissalui, can. Seguntin., 16/3/36

Ludo. de Ysten, scol. eccl. s. Petri extra muros Maguntin., 4/3/32

Ludo. Lupi de s. Facundo, 22/10/34

Ludo. de Marchion. de Romeniano, leg. doc., ardiac., Taurin. d. nostri pape, 10/12/34

fr. Ludo. Maurcleri, pr. Tassie, 5/6/33

mag. Ludo. de Monteliano, in art. et med. doc., 2/4/33

Ludo. Nythardi, iunior, lic. in decr., pleb., 31/10/32

Roderic. de Arevallo, in leg. bac., procionarius Burg., pro d. Ludo. Nunii de Toleto, decr. doc., cantore eccl. Burg., serenissimo d. reg. Castel. cancellario, 16/11/36

mag. Ludo. de Pirano, provincialis prov. s. Anth. de Padua, o. M., 15/3/34

mag. Ludo. Scaec, pro et nom. dd. abb. s. Petri et s. Bavonis, Gand., lic. in decr., 23/5/23
constituit mag. Jac. Robaille, can. Ambian., Joh. de Fonte, vic. d. ep. Ambian., Joh. de Lovania, Joh. Nicolai, dec. Tull., Robertus Fardella, Michael Amici, Lucianus de Senk, procuratores suos, 6/7/32

Ludo. de Visso de Spoleto, utr. iur. doc., 24/3/41

arep. Lugdun., 10/10/32 (Amedeus)

fr. Lupus de Galdo, provincialis Castelle, in sac. pag. mag., pro rego Castelle, 22/10/34

Lupus Valasci, in civili doc., 10/38

ab. de Lutra, o.s.B., Bisuntin. dio., 4/5/32

fr. Oliverius de Sales, pr. s. Spiritus, Brioc. dio., pro d. electo Maclovi., 11/2/35

Henricus Tock, can. Magdeburg., doc., amb. Magdeburg., 24/3/32

duo magistri missi per d. arep. Megdeburg., ep. Merseburg. et ep. Brandeburg. et u. studii Ephord., 8/2/32

G., Magion. in Ybernia ep., 23/5/32 (Nic. Wogomagus, o.M.)

Helbicus de Bopardia, dec. Wesal., nuncio arep. Colon. et Maguntin., 28/2/32

mag. Nyc. de Cusa, dec. de Confluenci., nuncio arep. Colon. et Magunt., 29/2/32

scol. Maguntin., proc. d. Maguntin., 11/4/32

arep. Meguntin., 14/8/32

Hermannus Rost, lic. in decr., dec. eccl. b. Marie Virginis maioris, Maguntin., 21/8/32
-proc. ep. Mag., 23/8/32

dec. Maguntin., amb. arep. Maguntin., 12/12/32

Joh. Swert de Monasterio, in decr. lic., pro d. Maguntin. moderno, 3/2/36

vic. Maguntin., 29/11/32
-pro parte cleri Maguntin., 21/8/33
-pro et nom electi Baioc., 6/10/33

mag. Arn. de Brenda, can. Herbipol., pro d. cantore Maguntin. et se ipso, 28/7/36

Theo. Knebel, can. Maguntin., proc. et nom. proc. cap. eiusdem eccl., 28/1/32

Maillardus de Thesio, pr. b. Marie de Glastra, Ebredun., 25/6/39

Guillermus Salez, in utr. lic., pro ep. Malleac., 14/5/34

Galeacius de Mantua, pro cap., 30/4/34

Manuel de Gallis, decr. doc., can. eccl. cath. Urgell., 9/11/36

Bartholomeus Junkerdella, proc. d. Manuelis Navarro, in leg. lic., rect. eccl. parr. de Ternyons, dio. Valentine, 16/10/39

ep. Marchican., 19/11/34

Marchus de Paveronibus, s. Michaelis, Cremone veteris, prep., 4/37

Marcus, prep. eccl. Janu., 6/8/34

Marcus de Faucello, 18/3/35

Marcus de Maronibus, decr. doc., pro clero, dio. Cuman., 2/4/33

Marcus Milo, nom. proprio et cleri Ast., 14/5/33

Marcus de Tanda, ardiac. in eccl. Cretensi, sciens lit. grecas, 2/4/34

ab. mon. s. Marie de Aquafrigidia, Cist. o., 26/7/32

ab. s. Marie de Aqualonga, o. Cist., Papi. dio., 27/6/32

monachus, pr. mon. s. Marie de Avencio, decr. doc., 20/11/33

Joh. Anhem, can. Tridentin., pro prep. b. Marie in Grien et s. Mich. Trid. dio., o. can. reg., 6/7/36

generalis o. b. Marie de Mercede, 3/39

Rodolphus Eglofft, proc. mon. Mariscelle, Constanci. dio., o.s.B., proprie nom., 3/7/39

Marquardus Sprenger, in art. mag., rect. parr. eccl. in Bermensgat, Frising. dio., 15/7/40

fr. Marsilius in Bethborn, Premonst., Colon. prep., 6/37

fr. Mart., lect. Minorum, Basil., 1-2/39

mag. Mart. le Berruyer, pro ep. Cenoman., can. Turon., 9/1/33

Mart., pr. mon. in Buch, p. Cist., Mis. dio., mag. in art., et in theo. bac., 31/3/41

Mart. Calitas, clericus Olomuc. dio., in art. Paris. et med. mag., necnon bac. in theo., 10/4/39

Mart. Celer, bac. in decr., pro abb. non exemptis o.s.B., Salzburg. dio., 2/1/33

fr. Mart. de Colon., o.M., 10/7/33

Mart. Fernandi de Caveis Rubeis, 22/10/34

Mart. Lefranc, in art. mag., d. nostri pape secretarius, 1/7/40

Mart. Maucourt, lit. apost. abbrev., arpresb. de Fixa, Andegau. dio., 16/4/34

mag. Mart, de Milthchen, proc. ep. Nuemberg., 9/1/33

mag. Mart. Nichel, decr. doc., can. et scol. s. Petri
iunioris, Argentin., 26/1/33

Mart. Queseel, mag. in art. et bac. in theo., can. Nivern.,
3/12/34

Mart. Sancii, Degenul, 9/2/33

Mart. Sanxius, presb., 20/11/33

ab. Mart. Scotorum, Wienn., 12/2/32

fr. Mart. de Senghin, religiosus mon. Medling., o.s.B.,
Patavi. dio., pro ab., 2/4/34

Mart. de Walthausen, can. reg. s. A., 29/1/32

Mart. de Vera, decr. doc., amb. regis Aragonum, 5/38

Mart., ab. s. Andree, Versell., 7/9/36

proc. cap. Ploc., 11/4/32
-proc. ducum Masovie et Custos Ploc., 11/17/32

r. p. d. Ludo. de Glandeues, olim ep. Venci., nunc Masseli.
in propria persona, medio iuramento concilio inc., 23/4/35

Massinus, ab. mon. b. Marie Vallis Serene, o. Cist., Parm.
dio., 22/9/36

Maternus Frencheychener, mag. in art., lic. in decr., 24/12/34

Mat. Baelinger, rect. parr. eccl. s. Nic. prope Villach,
Saltzeburg. dio., secretarius quondam r. d. patriarche
Aquilegi., 26/9/39

Mat. Bertheloti, lic. in decr. de u. Andegav., 5/3/34

Mat. Fabri, presb. Corisopit. dio., mag. in art., 14/8/39

Mat. Fornierii, prep. de Subtergan., Lemovic. dio., o.s.B.,
10/9/34

Mat. Maignage, adm. pro ep. Andegav., 8/6/33
-proc. ep. et cap., 12/6/33

fr. Mat. de Placenia, 26/5/33

discretus vir, mag. Mat. de Tribolia, proc. cap. Virdun.,
11/4/32

Mat. de Vaudreyo, pr. priorat Vagion. Rimi, Lingon. dio., 27/11/39

Mat. de Velz, secretarius d. card. Placentini, 17/10/32

Mathias Weczhem, Guistion., dio. Camin., prep., 6/37

Mattheus Bruyant, can. Attrebat., 26/9/32

Mavaldus De Lains, Iescuri. beneficiatus, in dio. Eln., bac. in decr., 8/4/40

Ogerius, ep. Maurian., 1/7/40 (Ogerius de Confleto)

Mauricius Baudeti, rect. parr. eccl. s. Mansueti, Tull., 16/7/40

Mauricius de Spergoweghe, comes de Spergoweghe maioris et s. Gereonis Colon., eccl. can., 26/11/35

arep. Mediolan., 16/4/32 (Bartholomeus de la Capra)

ab. s. Ambrosii, Mediolan., 14/1/32

ab. s. Simpliciani, Mediolan., 8/6/36

ab. s. Vicencii, Mediolani., 14/8/33 (recte: Vincencius, ab. s. Victoris extra muros Mediolan.)

ab. Medianmonasterii, o.s.B., Tull. dio., 3/5/32

fr. Mart. de Senghin, religiosus mon. Medling., o.s.B., Patavi. dio., pro ab., 2/4/34

Menendus Petri, leg. lic., 1/2/39

mag. Mercardus de Stiten, can. Lubic., pro ep. et. cap. Ozili., 9/3/36

Mermetus Prioris, presb. rect. parr. eccl. de Cossinayo, Lausan. dio., 1/7/40

duo mag. missi per d. arep. Magdeburg., ep. Merseburg. et ep. Brandenburg. et u. Studii Ephord., 8/2/32

Petrus Heser, proc. dd. Merseburg. Noeberg., ep., 12/3/32

mag. Joh. Hebardi, can. Merseburg., pro ep., 9/1/33

Joh. Dionii, cur. s. Benigni Met., pro ab. s. Arnulphi, Met., 30/3/33

Robertus ad Iocalia, pro tribus abb. civitatis Met., 2/3/33

mag. Petrus Pointerii, pro cap. Met., 16/6/33

Joh. Werini, pro et nom. cap. Met., 20/1/33

mag. Petrus de Noyron, decr. doc., pro et nom. d. ep. Met., et nom. proprio, 14/3/33

ep Met., 2/4/34 (Conradus Beyer de Boppard)

mag. Mich. clericus, mag. Cuillermi de u. Paris., 9/1/33

Nic. de Sola, decr. doc., off. Abrinc., pro ep. et. cap. Abrinc., licet pro abb. s. Mich. et Bellobech., 4/5/32

Mich. Adolphi, ebdomaderius curatus loci de Lasiree, Gerund. dio., presb., 5/6/39

Mich. Amici, proc. Ludo. Scaec., 6/7/32

Mich. Andree, secretarius d. regis Francie et ducis Brittanie, cur. eccl. parr. de Castro Theobaldi, Nannet. dio., 30/12/35

mag. Mich. Anglici, sacre theo. prof., can. Eborac., 7/8/33

fr. Mich. de Anguera, pr. priorat. s. Genesii de Ruppeforti, o.s.B., Barchinon. dio., 14/8/39

Mich. Balduini, in art. mag. et in sacra pag. bac., Paris., lic. in leg., pro u. studii generalis Avinion., et nom. propriis, 19/9/32

d. Mich., capel. de Boulencuria, 17/4/34

Mich. de Brixna, in decr. lic., 11-12/42

Mich. Conrardi, scol. Scarbimir., Cracovi. dio., 9/11/36

fr. Bernhardus Mich., sacrista mon. s. Mich. de Cussiano, o.s.B., Eln. dio., proc. ab. dicti mon., 29/4/40

Mich. de Dallon, in decr. lic., 4/37

Mich. de Forasio, bac. in decr., Gebenn. dio., 13/5/40

Mich., b. Marie de Rosis, Gerund. dyo., ab., 1/38

Mich. Jacobi, can. eccl. Onolzpac., 10/2/40

Mich. Jacobi de Ratzewoye, decr. doc., rect. parr. eccl. Omnium Sanctorum in civitate Cracovi., 4/5/39

Mich. Mat. de Schiltowff, decr. doc., rect. parr. eccl., in Liboutscha, Camin. dio., scol. Cracovi., 8/7/40

Mich. de Melino, ardiac. de Baessa in eccl. Gien., pro et nom. ep. Luc., 25/9/33

Mich. Molitoris, rect. parr. eccl. in Terrolis, Cumane dio., 7/8/39

Mich. de Novo, can. Taurin., 15/7/40

Mich. de Praga, amb. ducis Mediolan., 16/4/32

fr. Mich. de la Rippta, pr. Lustriaci, o. Cluniac., Lausan. dio., nom proprio, 21/6/40

Mich. Roderici, 9/2/33

mag. Mich. Schipaut, lic. in decr. et bac. in leg., 22/5/39

Mich. de Tabureto, de nobili genere procreatus, can. eccl. de Montecallerio, elect. prepositus ejusdem eccl., 20/11/39

Mich., ab. de Tironio, 23/7/34

N. ab. Milestat., Salczeburg. dio., 1-2/42

Milo de Carraria, pro ep. Ast., 18/3/35

ab. Bone Vallis, pro ep. Mimat., 24/4/34

Bertoldus Bolenoue, lic. in decr., pro ep. et cap., Mind., 17/4/34

gen. Minorum, 5/3/34

ep. Misn., 6/2/33 (Joannes Hofemann)

Joh. Eldach, bac. in utr., proc. d. arep. Dublin., ep. Moed., 20/11/33

Henr. de Keppel, vicedominus Monasteri., nom. ep. Monaster., 24/10/32

Ulricus Faeler, commendator seu precept. domus s. Joh. Jher. in Monester, Ratispon. dio., pro ipso et vice ac nom. conv. ipsius domus, 11/5/32

Monetus Boysserd, 14/1/35

Egidius de Laire, pro pr. de Montibus in Hanonia, 10/9/34

Steph, de Orba, dec. eccl. coll. Montisbiligardi, Bisuntin.
    dio., suo et cap. sui proc. nominibus, 6/8/35

pr. Montis Falconis, 24/12/34

proc. prep. Montin Jovis, o. can. reg., 21/11/32

Guil de la Sauerge, proc. mon. Montis Maioris, 27/2/33

pr. Montin Maioris, Arelat. dio., 27/8/34

Aymericus, ep. Montis Regalis (Aymericus de Segaudo)

pr. Montis Richerii, dio, Lausan., o. Cluniac., 7/28/32

Guill. Ebles, pro et nom. cap. Ruthen., o. can. reg., s.
    Flori dio., 18/3/33
    -pro prep. Montis Salvi, 18/9/33

proc. cap. Morian., vocatus d. Anth. la Viniaco, can. eiusdem
    eccl., 25/2/33

Thom. Morbech, lic. in decr., pro et nom. ep. et cap.
    Morinensi., 3/10/32

mag. Petrus Fortis, pro cap. Morinensi., 16/4/34

pr. Funr., o. Premonst., pro ab. et o., 6/6/32
    -proc. prep. Loz, Morinensi. dio., 11/9/32

ab. de Mulbruno, 29/2/32

N., doc. med., 5/37

dec. Nancie, dio. Gebenn., 20/5/35

Natalis Crispini, rect. s. Ant. de Calbani, Majoric. dio.,
    27/6/39

fr. Ant. Acrimont., proc. et nom. mag. Natalis Gaber, pr.
    conv. Mercedis, Barchinon. civitatis, 5/10/39

Natalis Graloni, presb. cur. de Buiray, Corisopit., 13/11/33

Nicholaus de Cremona, o. fr. A., mag. in theo., 24/10/32 fr. Nicholaus Jaquel, o.P., de conventu Divion., pro se ipso, 16/1/33

Nicholaus,proc. d. ep. Patavi., 22/5/32

Nicholaus Surach, dec. Brixin., nom suo proprio; et debent deliberare dd. de communibus si pro d. Brixin ep. veniat adm., 9/9/32
-proc. ep. Brixin., 11/12/32

mag. Joh. de Valle, off. Nici., pro se et ep. Nici., 4/7/32

Ludo., ep. Nici., 13/10/41 (Ludo. Vadati)

Nicodus Bourgoygnoni, presb. cur. eccl. parr. de Malagniace, Genen. dio., 14/8/39

fr. Nic., d. comitis Angeli de Sens, lic. in theo., o. P., 15/9/36

mag. Jeronimus Gothelzanck, prep. eccl. Plomuc., tam nom. proprio quam proc. r. p. d. Nic. in arep. eccl. Prag. electi et provisi, 3/11/41

Nic. Amote, o.M., lector in theo. de Ulma, Constanci. dio., 29/1/40

Nic. de Bartice, 14/1/35

Nic., lector conv. Augustin. Basil., 1-2/42

fr. Nic., o.M. de Bohemia, 9/1/33

fr. Nic. Bouridon, p. P., 26/8/32

fr. Nic., pr. mon. Fontis Salutis, o. Cist., dio. Eistet., proc. eius d. mon., bac. form. in theo., 20/11/33

Nic. Helstraw, 3/9/34

Nic., ab. mon. in Lymberg, o.s.B., Spir. dio., 3/11/36

fr. Nic., prep. mon. S. Andree, prope villa Maguntin., 29/7/35

Nic., ab. s. Marie Fontis, o. Cist., Parm. dio., 4/11/33

Nic., ab. de Prenczahusen, August. dio., 29/7/35

Nic., prep. s. Tiburcii, 8/4/35

Nyc. Amici, in sac. theo. lic., amb. u. Paris., 8/4/31

Nic. de Atholia, precentor, 8/2/34

Nic. Ballangha, in decr. lic., 8/38

Nic. Banderii, monach. Montismaior., 26/3/35

Nic. Bissalus, in leg. lic., 3/38

Nic. Borellerii, can. Cabilon., 5/12/32

Nic. de Bramoncuria, s. Flori Nodiani, Tull., elect. ab., 9/38

Nic. Brissault, lic. in leg., 28/3/38

Nic. Broveraet, presb. Leodin. dio., 6/4/33

Nic. Burledi, presb., mag. in art., 19/2/40

Nic. de Capella, dec., 20/7/36

fr. Nic. Carbanelli, pr. s. Petri de Sonna, Vienn., o.s.B., 28/9/36

Nic. de Cipro, mag. in theo., minister prov. Terre Sancte, 30/7/34

Nic. Clerici, ardiac Nitri. et can. Strigon., nuncius et amb. dd. arep. Strigon. et trium suffraganeorum, 16/2/32

Nic. de Columbus, can. eccl. Vincentine, pro cap., 7/5/34

Nic. Conflans, presb., 17/4/33

Nic. Constancii, decr. doc., ardiac. de Vitello in eccl. Tull., 28/3/38

Nic., ab. mon. Coprunuc., o. Cist., Cracovi. dio., 9/6/41

Nic. Cordi, lic. in decr., pr. Biterr. dio., 19/10/36

Nic. Brobran, s. Martini, Basil., 11-12/42

Nic. Croseti, decr. doc., pr. b. Marie de Plateria, o. can. reg., Lugndun. dio., 23/7/34

mag. Nyc. de Cusa, dec. de Confluencia, nuncio arep Colon., Maguntin., doc. decr., 29/2/32

Nic. de Eschwilre, presb. Leodi. dio., rect. parr. eccl. de Bastonia, dicte dio., 31/7/39

Nic. Falloni, mag. in art., cur. eccl. parr. b. Marie de Novavilla, Majoric. dio., 5/6/39

Nyc. de Forlivio, medicus, ardiac in eccl. Leodi., familiaris card. Rothomag., 7/10/33

Nic. Franqueti, mag. in art., can. Suession., 18/2/35

Nic. Frasier, can. eccl. cath. Leon., 15/4/40

Nic. Freron, mag. in art., rect. parr. eccl. de Brione, Vien. dio., 29/5/39

Nic. Gehe, lic. in leg., adiunctis ambassiatoribus d. Karoli, Francorum regis, 10/12/34

Nic. Geron, presb., vic. perpetuus in eccl. Basil., 30/7/40

Nic. Guidonis, o.M., proc. prov. Turon., 18/9/33

Nyc. de Hart, presb. cap. s. Theoderici Minoris-Basilee, 18/9/39

Nic. zer Heg, alias Westerman, capel. perpetuus in eccl. Basil., r. p. card. Arelat. familiaris, lit. hujus sacri concilii scriptor, 10/4/39

Nic. Hermessent. mag. in art. et lic. in decr., pro u. Paris., 29/10/34

Nic. Hildebrandi, thes. eccl. s. Petri iunioris, Argentin., 22/6/36

Nic. de Jangilgiaciis, ab. s. Micaelis de Passiniano, o. Vallisumbrose, Fesulan. dio., 23/6/41

Nic. Ylo, off. et can., Misn., bac. in decr., 23/7/34

Nic. Johannes, pr. priorat. conv. s. Honorine de Girardivilla, o. can. reg. s. A., Rothomag. dio., nobilis ex utr. parente, 9/5/39

Nic. Johannis de Novocastro, cur. de Compno-Stephano, Tull. dio., 16/10/39

Nic. Kop, rect. eccl. parr. in Eyniken, Basil. dio., 12/2/40

Nic. Lervaillers, presb. cur. de Agmerialla, Bajoc. dio., 27/11/39

Nyc. Lindenstrumpff, pro parte ep. Argentin., 12/31

Nic. Loyseleur, prep. de Ingreyo, in eccl. Carnot., 23/10/34

mag. Nic. Loiseleur, can. Rothomag., pro d. Nic. de Vendres, lic. in leg., ardiac. de Augo in eccl. Rothomag., 12/10/36

Nic., ab. mon. de Lucella, o. Cist., Basil. dio., 1-6/43

Nic. Magni, amb. comitis Palatine, mag. in theo., 4/5/32

Nic. Manessier, in art. mag., Ambian. can., 2/11/39

Nic. de Mantua, pr. priorat. s. Apolinaris, o.s.B., Veron. dio., 12/5/41

Nic. de Marolo, pro ab. s. Fructuosi, Janu. dio., 25/9/33

Nic. Meltzer, doc. in med., clericus Pomezani. dio., 29/10/39

Nic. Mormen, vic. perpetuus in eccl. Minden., 25/7/39

Nic. de Nova Indagine, lic. in utr. iur., proc. cap. Bamberg., 1/4/32
-nom. d. ep. Bamberg., 4/2/33

Nic. Nudi, pro Studio Louvani., 23/7/34

Nic. Nuwehusen, presb. rect. eccl. parr. in Turincken, Basil. dio., 23/1/40

Nic. de Orto Celi, o. servorum b. Marie., 16/8/32

Nic. Pare, presb. prep. in Slengen, Misn. dio., bac. in decr., 19/8/35

Nic. Pauli de Tournout, rect. parr. eccl. de Vlardinghen, Traject. dio., 17/6/40

Nic. de Petrisalbis, lic. in decr., 9/11/36

Nic. Petz, thes. Hildeszem., 6/38

Nic. Pontani, can. Anici., 10/2/36

Nic. de Truneta, doc. utr. iur., 1/38

Nic. Requise, can. Basil., 4/3/33

fr. Nic. Rozembergh, pr. Selle d. Pauline, pro ab., 30/3/34

Nic., ab. de Sellis, Bituric. dio., 1/37

Nic. Syned, prep. s. Curcis in Northusen, Maguntin. dio., 10/38

Nic. Slegel, can. eccl. Frising., 17/2/41

Nic. de Sola, decr. doc., off. Abrinc. pro ep. et cap. Abrinc., licet pro abb. s. Michaelis et de Bellobecho, 4/5/32

Nic. de Spataronis, can. eccl. Civitatensis, pro cap., 2/4/34

Nic. de Spinallo, 17/4/33

Nic. Stanislai de Kalkevice, perpetuus beneficiatus in eccl. Cracovi., 10/3/41

Nic. Stok. amb. d. Rom. regis, 13/6/32

Nic., decr. doc., cantor et can. eccl. Strigorn., 30/6/33
-pro cap. Strigorn., 25/9/33

Nic. Thibout, mag. in theo., 5/6/33

mag. Nic. Loiseleur, can. Rothomag., pro d. Nicolao de Vendres, lic. in leg., ardiac. de Augo in eccl. Rothomag., 12/10/36

Nic. Wenke, can. Wratislavi., proc. ep., 8/4/32

Nic. Vexion., amb. reg. Dacie, 15/3/34

Nic. Vipech, 18/3/35

mag. Nic. Volrast, 16/1/34

ab. de Nive, o. Premonst., 14/1/34

nobilis Canderi, bac. in decr., 10/2/36

Pet. Heser, proc. dd. Merseburg., Noeberg., ep., 12/3/32

Marcus, ep. Nol., 25/4/32

Nornamus de Conespitel, Dol. dio., bac. in leg., capel. capellanie de Males in eccl. Brioc., de nobili genere procreatus, 8/7/40

ep. Novari., 7/3/32 (Bartholomeus de Vicecomitibus)

mag. Mart. de Milthchen, proc. ep. Nuemberg., 9/1/33

Nunius Aluari, beneficiatus in eccl. Conch., in decr. bac., 23/10/34

Theo. Jad, can. eccl. s. Quirini, Nussi., pro cap. Nussi., 17/10/32

ab. de Nuwiler, Argentin., 12/31

Nuz de Kaernynine, clericus Corisopit. dio., mag. in art. ac de nobili genere ex utr. parente procreatus, rect. parr. eccl. de Punerit, dicte dio., 14/8/39

Obertus de Sunerinis, prep. Montiscalerii, Taurin. dio., can Keri., 18/12/39

Odo, prothonotarius, pro arep. Beneventano, 4/2/35

ep. Olomuc., 12/6/33 (Conradus de Zwola)

Pet. Denisoti, proc. ab. Omnium Sanctorum in Insula, Cathalani. dio., o. A., 13/11/33

Augustinus Auwer, proc. ill. princ. d. Nicolai, ducis Oppavi., 4/9/39

pr. Orti Christi, pr. Cartus., 11/4/32

Otto de Lapide, amb. comitis Palatine, decr. doc., 4/5/32

fr. Oddo de Avevilla, pr. priorat. de Sacrofago, o.s.B., Lingo. dio., 12/6/39

ab. mon. de Odemburg, o.s.B., Aquilegi. dio., 27/1/34

Odetus de Clara Valle, in leg. lic., 7/38

fr. Odo de Balna, elemosinarius Paterniaci, 4/5/36

Odo de Varris, prothonotarius, 4/6/34

Oliverius Cauer, proc. cap. cath. eccl. Leon., 15/4/40

mag. Oliverius Greuet, in art. et med. mag., 13/11/33

Oliverius Huieti, cur. montis s. Joh., Andegavi. dio., 11/2/35

Oliverius Maden, presb. cur. de Bauuceyo, Redon. dio., in utr. iur. bac., 7/9/36

Oliverius Mardent, in utr. iur. bac., proc. d. Petri. ab. de Abazina, Lemovic. dio., o. Cist., 11/3/40

fr. Oliverius de Sales, bac. in decr., pr. priorat. s. Spiritus, Baioc. dio., o. s. Aug., 10/12/34
-pro d. electo Maclovi., 11/2/35

Oliverius Textoris, can. Aqu. in Provincia et pro dec. Genestasibus Narbon. dio., 18/3/40

Oliverius Twissz, 1/12/36

Olmerius Suessini, lic. in leg., 4/12/39

Hugo, Ostensis, ep., 9/37 (Hugo de Urries)
-inc. 1-2/39

card. Bononi. in propria persona, 6/4/33 (Anthonius Bononiensis, card. ep. Ostiensis, Ant. Corrarius)

mag. Otto de Bens, mag. in art., 18/9/33

Otto de Samberch, can. A., 27/6/32

Otto Verenbach, scol. eccl. b. Marie, Isnac., Maguntin. dio., presb., 31/7/39

Ludo. Gundissalui, can. Legion., proc. d. ep. Ouev., 22/10/34

Alf. Garcie, leg. doc., proc. d. arep. Compostellan. et d. ep. Burg. et Oxom., 22/10/34

Ludolphus, thes. Ozili., pro ep. Ozili., 23/1/34

mag. Mercardus de Stiten, can. Lubic., pro ep. et cap. Ozili., 9/3/36

P., ab. mon. s. Mich. in Lapide, o.s.B., Hildesm., 11/5/36

P. Martini, can. Seguntin., 3/6/35

Hermannus Regelhusen, can. Padebrun., pro cap., 2/4/34

Lucidus Petri, decr. doc., pro cap. Paduano, 30/4/34

Pantaleon de Mintzich, can. mon. s. Leodegarii, Vallismasonis, Basil. dio., 22/5/39

Panthaleon de Mutzich, rect. parr. eccl. in Gitwilr, can. mon. s. Leodegarii, Vallismasonis, Basili. dio., 5/6/39

ep. Papi., 22/3/32 (Franciscus)

Steph. de Cassis de Novuria, leg. doc., 9/4/32
    -onus proc. ab. s. Martini, Papi., 9/4/32
    -tam proprio nom. quam nom. ab. s. Lanfranchi, Papi., 14/4/32

pr. s. Maroli, Pavia, 11/4/32

ab. s. Martini, Papi., o.s.B., 9/4/32
    -adm. est pro ab. s. Bartholomei Papiensi, 15/9/32

proc. ab. s. Petri in Celo Aureo, Papi., 11/4/32

N. Papi., 4/37

Paregencia de Foresta, presb. vicar. parr. eccl. de Comana, bac. in decr., 14/5/34

personaliter s. Petri in Silva, Parentine dio., ab. 1/38

Nic. Hermessent, mag. in art. et lic. in decr., pro u. Paris., 29/10/34

mag. Gerardus Perriere, dec. Cabilon., pro cap. Paris., 11/8/33

pr. s. Martini, Paris., 27/8/34

ep. Parm., 29/2/32 (Delphinus Angeli de Pergula)

fr. Pascasius, o. Humiliatorum, 11/8/33

Pascasius de Pino, o. M., confessor, proc. card. s. Eustacii, 21/6/32

Pascasius de Rivola, o. Hum., pro clero Cumano, 17/9/34

pr. mon. de Passeleto, o.s.B., Glasgu. dio., 3/12/34

Nic., proc. d. ep. Patavi., 22/5/32

ambassiatores d. ep. Patavi. et cleri dio., 12/2/32

ep. Patavi., 9/4/34 (Leonardus de Layming)

Patricius Frasez, can. eccl. Ros. in Scocia, 17/12/34

Petricius Mader, elect. provisus mon. b. Marie de Der, o. Cist., Aberdon. dio., 10/3/41

Patricius, ardiac. Glasgu., 8/2/34

Ghisebertus Karoli, pro ab. s. Amandi in Paubul, Tornac. dio., 23/7/35

Paulus de Ananie, 19/11/34

Paulus Arg., proc., 6/37

Paulus Ghiesquiere, bac. in theo., o. Valliscolarium de Montibus in Hasnonia, pro prioribus existentibus in dio. Leodi., 15/10/34

Paulus de Grysheim, mag. in art. et in sacra theo. bac. formatus, can. eccl. coll. b. Marie ad gradus Coloni., 20/6/39

Paulus Manthart, in decr. lic., 1-6/43

Pellarius Clapper, sacrista b. Marie de Altura Ville, Balneoloci, Gerund., 28/3/38

Percevallus, ab. mon. s. Stephani, Vercell. o.s.B., 26/10/39

Peregrinus de Goch, mag. in art., 20/11/33

ep. Pergam., 15/5/33 (Franciscus de Regatis)

Jac., p. d. Martini, ep. Petin., prov. Aquilegi., tam proc. nom. quam nom. proprio, 12/5/41

capel. d. ep. Petragoric., 7/5/32

pr. Petrecastri, amb. ducis Sabaudiae, o. Cart., 11/9/31

card. s. Petri ad vincula, 28/11/32
-card. de Columpna, proc. card. s. Petri ad vincula, 19/11/34

ab. s. Petri, super Diviam, 5/6/33

prep s. Petri, ex parte cleri, 12/31

Oliverius Mardent, in utr. iur. bac., proc. d. Petri, ab. de Abazina, Lemovic. dio., o. Cist., 11/3/40

Petrus Ade, in decr. lic., 3/38

fr. Petrus de Aguilar, in theo. bac., 22/10/34

Pet. Albi, presb. secularis de Glenuaco, 14/5/35

Pet. Aligeti, lic. in utr., 14/7/36

Guil. de Layens, can. Laud., pro ab. mon. s. Pet. Altimont., o.s.B., Camerac. dio., 22/5/39

Pet. Arnulphi, pr. de Biturreta, o.s.A., Avinion. dio., in decr. bac., 21/11/40

Pet. de Arsen, scol. Daventri., 5/12/32

Pet. de Asseribus, 10/2/36

Pet. de Avinione, bac. in decr., can. b. Marie de Minorissa, Vic. dio., 16/10/39

mag. Pet. Bailliui, can. Paris., religiosus de Hasnonio, 23/2/32

Pet. de Barlo, ab. mon. s. Ruffini de Mantua, o.s.B., 4/11/40

Pet. Baronis, dec. Lucion. dio., 18/2/35

Pet. de Baussellis, can. Maclovi., 3/6/35

Pet., dec. Bellic., 2/1/33

Pet. Belliconis, precept. s. Anth. Graciopolitan., 3/38

mag. Pet. de Berich, in art. et med. doc., 19/3/34

Pet. Berteti, cur. ville Reversure, Lugdun. dio., bac. in decr., 23/10/39

fr. Pet. Blandigii, o.M., mag. in theo., minister Burgundie, 29/5/33

mag. Joh. de Zagobia, proc. d. Pet. de Boccanegra, dec. Conch., consilliari regis Castelle, 7/10/33

Pet. Bochardi, presb. perpetuus cappellanus cappellanie in eccl. s. Georgii Zayaci, Lugdun., 20/10/41

Pet. Bocketi, decr. doc., 29/4/40

Pet. Bolomerii, ab. Alte Cumbe, o. Cist. Gebenn. dio., decr. doc., 31/3/41

Pet. Boneti, lic. in decr., 3/38

Pet. Borbayaci, beneficiatus in eccl. cath. Lodov., 25/6/39

Pet. de Boscho, Carm. precent., 7/38

Pet. Bousandi, bac. in decr., 17/12/34

d. Pet., prep. eccl. Brandeburg., decr. doc., 15/3/34

mag. Pet. de Brena, dec. Belvac., 20/11/33

Pet. de Brena, cant. eccl. Lingon., pro mag. Joh. Gobillon, electo in ep. Lingon., 17/4/34

Pet. Breviscalige, presb. can. Belvac. et rect. parr. eccl. s. Eulalie de Dompnoleyo, Lausann. dio., 31/3/41

Pet. Campis, pr. priorat. s. A., ville Perpiniaci, in sacra pag. bac., 18/9/39

Pet. de Carmano, ardiac. de Calathambro in Therasi., 7/38

Pet., o. Carm., mag. in theo., 3/10/32

fr. Pet. de Causaco, bac. in decr., pr. conv. Lingonie, Nannet., 27/10/36

Ysidorus de Rosate, decr. doc., pro se et ab. s. Petri in Celo Aureo, Papi., 28/11/32

mag. Joh. Peregallus, pro ab. s. Petri in Celo Aureo. Papi., o.s.A., 28/9/36

Pet. de Chalkembergh, can. eccl. s. Florini, Confluencie, 30/7/34

Pet. Charverii, can. Bisuntin., 19/10/36

Pet. Cheniti, in art. mag., rect. parr. eccl. de Quinterat, Brioc. dio., 23/7/40

Pet. Chivalerii, presb. dec. ruralis, Albone, Gebenn., 10/11/41

Pet. Clementis, in med. doc., 8/38

fr. Pet. de Cole, regni Aragonum, lic. in theo., 30/7/34

fr. Pet. Colongerii, pr. priorat. b. Marie de Boissia, o.s.A., Lugdun. dio., 10/11/41

Pet. Consolenti, lic. in leg., can. beatissimi Ilarii maioris Pictavi., 29/4/35

Pet. Coqueti, rect. parr. eccl. de Lupunaco, Redon. dio., 29/10/39

Pet. de Corduba, lic. in decr., 9/2/33 (Petrus Ispanus)

Pet. de Corodes, prep. de Slestat, Argent. dio., 9/1/33

Pet. s. Cucufatis, 6/38

Pet., bac., presb. cur. s. Petri de Cureriis, Ruthen., 7/9/36

Pet. Dasserii, bac. in decr., can. Pictav. et Vaur. eccl., 6/8/35

Pet. Denisoti, proc. ab. Omnium Sanctorum in Insula, Chathalani. dio., o.A., 13/11/33

Pet. Dispon, presb. beneficiatus in eccl. s. Petri, Avinion., 24/10/32

Pet. Dominici, presb. in eccl. metropolitana, Aqu., 27/11/39

Pet. de Flench, nobilis, mag. in art., cur. de Sellis, Tornac. dio., 31/12/35

Pet. de Flenkes, proc. Ludo. Scaec, 6/7/32

Pet. Flik, Patavi., off., 29/2/32

mag. Pet. Fortis, pro cap. Morin., 16/4/34

Pet. Francisci, in decr. lic., 3/37

Pet. Galhardi, lic. in decr., 20/11/35

Pet. de Gellia, lic. in leg., mag. in art., dec. eccl. coll. s. Sirici, Bituric. dio., 26/8/35

Pet. le Gentil, lic. in leg., 13/8/34

mag. Pet. Giberti, in decr. bac., rect. parr. eccl. de Chessenay, Andegav. dio., 18/12/39

Pet. Gillardi, bac. in leg., clericus, Maclovi. dio., 4/12/39

Pet. Gilli, rect. vic. eccl. parr. Castri Vitrii, Arelat. dio., 1/7/40

Pet. Gleshardi, dec. eccl. cath., Morian., 25/6/39

Pet. de Grolea, can. Lugdun., 8/7/40

mag. Pet. Guerin, doc. in med., can. eccl. Taurin., 28/4/41

Pet. Gufer, can. eccl. s. Bartholomei, Francford., lic. in decr., 24/4/34

Pet. Guffer, in decr. lic., 3/38

Pet. Guillioti, can. Trec., script. in registro bullarum, 8/7/40

Pet. Guillon, can. Venet., rect. parr. eccl. s. Medardi, Nannet. dio., 23/3/36

Pet. de Gusma, proc. d. mag. de Calatrava, 22/10/34

Pet. de Haya, bac. in decr., secretarius Britanie ducis, rect. parr. eccl. de Fleindel, 27/11/39

Pet. Haze, can. s. Joh. in Hawis, 11/3/35

Pet. Henrrici de Walrich, 1/6/36

Pet. Heser, proc. dd. Merseburg. Noeberg., episcoporum, 12/3/32

Pet. de Hobb, cappell. perpetuus et sacrista eccl. majoris Basili., 5/6/39

Pet. Hospitis, can. Lingon., 9/2/33

fr. Bartholomeus de Bolea, pr. Montissoni, nom. proc. d. Pet. Johannis, ardiac. Belchic. in eccl. Cesaraugustana, 2/11/39

Pet. de Isaat, prep. Arnhem., ardiac. in eccl. Traiect., 21/8/32

Pet. Julieti, presb. cur. parr. eccl. de Becyo, Cabilon. dio., 14/5/34

Pet. Juuenis. persona Camerac. dio., 18/6/35

Pet. Kalbe, can. Cesaraugust., 9/11/36

Pet. Kamermer, can. eccl. s. Joh. baptiste in civitatis Frising., capel. r. d. card. s. Calixti, 9/6/41

Pet. Kareman, dec. in Surburg, Argentin., 1-2/39

Pet. de Kennabach. pr. conv. Predicatorum in Warmacia, 10/7/32

Pet. Knap, mag. in art., lic. in mad., can. s. Stephani, Marguntini, 31/8/36

Pet. de Labonere, lic. in leg., nom. proc., r. p. d. ab. Panis Pontis, o.s.A., Maclovi. dio., 22/4/40

Pet. de Labonoro, lic. leg., 12/38

fr. Petrus, cappel. ab. s. Lamberti Salzburg., 2/5/33

Pet. de Lanneto, proc. ep. Ipori. pro ep. et cap., 19/12/32

Pet. Leonis, pr. mon. s. Albani, Basil., o. Clun., 2/11/39

fr. Pet. de Lila, pr. priorat. de Fregido Fonte, o. Cluni., Basil. dio., 8/4/40

Pet., decr. doc., pro u. Lubic., 3/37

Pet. zum Lufft, eccl. s. Petri, Basil., decr. doc., mag., 10/6/40

Aymo Hugenine, pr. claustralis priorat s. Pet. de Lunento, o.s.B., Gracianopolit. dio., de licencia pr. dicte priorat., 23/7/40

Joh. Godin, pro d. Pet. ab. majoris Monasterii, 26/9/39

fr. Pet. de Manso, bac. in decr., pr. priorat. de Cladato, o.s.A., Leon. dio., 9/5/39

Pet. Martelli, 26/3/35

Pet. Martini de Vaamonde, in decr. bac., 22/10/34

Pet. Martini, presb., 22/10/34

Pet. Maruffis de Janua, mag. in theo., 27/8/34

Pet. de Mellico, o.s.B., et quinque alii notabiles viri, religiosus mon. Mellici, 14/2/32

Pet. de Mera et Guillermus Gerardi de Ledis, decr. doctores, pro ep. et clero Traiect., 2/4/34

Pet. Militis, o.P., bac. in theo., Lugdun. dio., 28/4/41

Pet. de Monozaco, 10/10/32

Pet. Monterii, 4/6/34

mag. Pet. Montisardeti, lic. in decr., can. et ardiac. de Rivellon in eccl., Tull., 7/9/36

Pet. Mutonis, prep. s. Egidii de Peirecio, August. dio., capell. d. nostri Felicis pape V, 8/7/40

mag. Pet. de Noyron, decr. doc., pro et nom. d. ep. Met. et nom. proprio, 14/3/33

Pet. de Norcurens, can. reg. mon. Habundancie, rect. parr. eccl. de Pulliaco, Gebenn. dio., 27/5/40

Pet. Nubbet, de militari genere ex utr. parente procreatus, in leg. bac., rect. parr. eccl. de Pubberich, Corisopit. dio., 4/12/39

Pet. de Nussia, o. can. reg., 29/2/32

Pet. de Offenhein, o. b. Marie Theutonicorum, capel. mag. generalis Almani ejusdem o., 23/10/39

Pet. Oliverii, claviger Gerund., 3/37

fr. Pet. de Osterhagen, o. Premonst., 16/1/33

Pet. Passart, can. eccl. b. Marie Traiect., tam proprio quam cleri Traiect. nom., 17/9/34

Pet. Paulus, prep. Albingan., 20/7/36

fr. Pet. Pavarelli, monachus et capel. d. card. de Varambone, 1/7/40

Pet. Pennaluer, 9/2/33

Pet. Pichon, cant. et can. Maclovi., 12/11/34

Pet. Piocheti, lic. in leg., clericus Redon. dio., 12/2/40

mag. Petr. Pointerii, pro cap. Met., 16/6/33

Pet. de Ponte, capel. Camerac., can s. Gauerici, pro cap. Camerac., 8/5/32

Pet. Porcherii, doc. sacre pag., o.M., vic. o., 9/31

Pet. de Porres, ardiac. de Camazes, in eccl. Civitat., 10/2/33
-nom. ep. Ambul., 10/9/34
-proc. arep. Ispal., 22/10/34

Pet. de Pratis, presb., bac. in decr., corarius eccl. coll. s. Agricole, Avinion., 23/7/40

Petrus Preussin, capel. in eccl., s. Martini, Basil. ad altare b. Marie virginis, in art. mag., 10/6/40

Pet. Burbeyt, in decr. lic., 3/39

Pet. de Raelderen, can. b. Marie Aqu., 6/4/33

Pet. Ravinelli, ebdomadarius Anici. can., Bellijoci, Lugdun. dio., bac. in decr., 26/2/40

Pet. Reginaldeti, mag. in theo., o.M., Paris., 16/4/34

Pet. Remigii, scol. Toletan., proc. d. arep. Toletan. et d. ep. Cartagin., 22/10/34

fr. Pet. Revorii, pr. s. Philippi de Porta, Gracianopolitane dio., o. Cluniac., de nobili genere procreatus, 3/11/41

Pet. Richerii, pr. priorat., convent. b. Marie Aregands., Vapun. dio., 25/6/39

Pet. Ridonus, pro cap. eccl. Tarusin., 9/4/34

Pet., ab. mon. ss. Petri et Andree de Ripalta, Cist o., Taúrin. dio., 10/4/41

Pet. Rodel, prep. eccl. s. Leonardi, Basili., o. can. reg. s. A., 1/12/41

Pet. Romanelli, pr. Gigorcii, Di., 20/8/32

Pet. Rosellini, rect. parr. eccl. de Bacino, Lausan. dio., 11/9/39

Pet. Rouselli, mag. can. Lexovi., 9/3/36

Pet. Rouselli, can. eccl. s. Florentini de Ambasia, Turon. dio., secretarius r. d. Lugdun., et scriptor in registro bullarum, 20/6/39

mag. Pet. Salomonis, secretarius d. card. Rothomag., 16/1/33

Pet. de. s. Cruce, decr. doc., ardiac. majoris eccl. Valentin., 8/4/40

Pet. de s. Eulalia, doc. in decr., 7/38

mag. Pet. Sanxii, bac. in decr., 16/1/34

Pet. de Saxo, decr. doc., ab. Ambroniaci, o.s.B., Lugdun. dio., 12/6/39

Pet. de Serana de Lusyniano, Narbonn, prep., 6/37

Pet. Silvestris, in utr. iur. lic., can. et scol. eccl. Rem., 4/3/35

Pet. Syman, can. Lubic., 31/12/35

Pet. Sixion, in decr. lic., can. et hospitalarius eccl. Dertus., o. s. A. can. reg., 13/4/40

Pet. de Sogeto, decr. doc., can. Gebenn. et rect. eccl. parr. de Gissier, Gebenn. dio., 15/1/40

Pet. Soltzhercz, cur. parr. eccl. in Hunigen. Basil. dio. et capel. in eccl. Basil., 4/3/40

Pet. Somardi, primecerius u. Avinioni., 19/9/32
-pro ep. Riv., 20/4/34

Pet. de Sopia, utr. iur. doc., 9/4/34

Pet. Spinas, rect. parr. eccl. de Bressac, Magalon. dio., capel. d. Arelat., 12/6/39

Pet. Struch, ebdomadarius vic. cur. de Moliore, Gerund. dio., 22/4/40

fr. Pet. de Tagana, pr. Carpentatoric., 29/5/33

Pet. Tandouz, presb., bac. in decr., rect. eccl. parr. de Marsac, Nannet. dio., 23/10/39

Pet., ab. de Tela, o. Cist., Lausan. dio., 26/11/39

Pet. Teste, cur. de Fons, Claromont. dio., presb., 31/7/39

mag. Pet. Textoris, lic. in decr.,cappel. s. Pet., Basili., proc. ep. Laventin., 12/2/34

Pet. Theobaldi, 1/12/36

mag. Pet. de Tintaville, pro d. ep. Edu., adm. per dd. deputatos de xij, bac. in decr., ardiac., Edu., 26/8/35

Pet. Toulet, religiosus Aquinstint., pro et nom. ab. Aquiscint., Attrebat. dio., 28/3/32

Pet. de Trillia, decr. doc., ardiac. Lodov., 6/8/32
    -pro ep. Locov. et pro ipso, 12/9/32
    -proc. d. elect. Autissodor., 15/12/32
    -pro et nom. d. Joh. de Rocozello, can. eccl. Lodov., 9/2/33
    -proc. d. ep. Sarlat., 26/5/33
    -pro ab. Fontis Frigidi, o. Cist., Crass., o.s.B., s. Illari de Ilario, Carcasson. dio., 18/9/33
    -adm. et inc. nom. ab. Psalmodi., Nemas. dio., 4/11/33

mag. Pet. Vech, 1/6/36

Pet. Vedug, miles, o.s. Jacobi de Spata, 13/11/33

Pet. Veldel, lic. in decr., pr. Georsii, Die. dio., 4/7/32

Pet. Vicardi, cubicularis, d. card. Arelat., 1/10/34

mag. Pet. de Vico, mercato, mag. in theo., o.M., 9/4/34

fr. Pet. de Villa, pr. s. Mich. de Alonda, o.s.B., Tarentasi. dio., 21/6/40

Pet. de Villaren, 8/3/32

Pet. Vionerii, rect. eccl. parr. . . . Bellic. dio., in decr. bac., 1/7/40

Pet. de Undesdorf, can.reg. s. Aug., de familia protectoris, 29/2/32
    -proc. Ulrici Faeler, vice et nom. conv. s. Joh. Jher. in Monester, Regensburg, 11/5/32

mag. Pet. Voywin, provincialis Saxonie, o.b. Marie, 30/6/33

Pet. Zoceti, capel. d. ep. Foroiuli., 30/4/34

Philibertus de Ruppe, proc. ducis Sabaudiae in Romana Curia, lic. in leg., amb. ducis Sabaud., 9/9/31

Philibertus de Ruppe, lic. in leg., can. Lausan., nobilis, 23/7/40

Philippus Bourgong, can. Cathalau. et Nivern., mag. in art. et bac. in decr., 26/11/34

Philippus de Fontenellis, lic. in decr., dec. et can. Aquilegi., 2/4/34

Philippus Meyor, prep. Apt., 4/39

mag. Philippus Noriis, can. eccl. Dublin., in sacra pag. mag., 17/3/41

Philippus de s. Albino, can. Massili., secretarius d. card. Arelat., 16/11/36

Philippus de Serich, can. Trever., 15/5/33

Pinus de Ursis de Parma, ep., 2/1/33

ab. s. Salvatoris de Placencia, 18/9/33 (Piacenza)

ab. s. Pauli de Mezano de Placencia, pro se ipso et ep. Saon., 3/9/34 (Piacenza)

card. Placentinus, (Branda de Castillione) (Piacenza), 21/8/32
-pro et nom. d. ep. Baioc., sui nepotis, 21/11/32

ep. Placentinus, 13/11/33 (Alexius de Siregno, o.M.) (Piacenza)

mag. Alb. de Ferrariis, utr. iur. doc., proc. d. ep. Placentini, 13/6/32 (Plasencia)
-adm. est proc. cap. Placentine et pro ab. s. Savini de Plasencia, 21/11/32

Gundissaluus, ep. Placentinus, 22/10/34 (Gundissaluus de s. Maria) (Plasencia)

Georgius de Placencia, pro abb. s. Sepulcri et s. Sabini, civitatis Placentine, 22/10/34 (Plasencia)

arpresb. eccl. s. Martini de Plebe Saxi, 20/11/33

pr. de Ploceyo Grimoldi, Baioc. dio., o.s.A., 14/8/33

Joh. Pollart, mag. in art. et bac. in decr., cant. et can. s. Andree, Colon., pro se ipso et ep Ploc., 14/5/35

proc. ducum Masovie et custos Ploc., 11/17/32
-proc. cap. Ploc., 11/4/32

ep. Plovac., 15/3/34 (Sanctus de Ferraria, o.P.)

Polignia ci, dec., 6/12/32

fr. Laurencium, o.s.Trinitatis, proc. o. ss. Martirum de regno Polonie, 24/7/32 ab. de Polonie et quidam alius abbas, 17/10/33

ep. s. Poncii, 18/8/36 (Geraldus de la Bricoigne)

fr. Poncius Fongerons, o.M., mag. in theo., inq. Avinion., 3/10/32

Ponsardus Clerici, can. Met., 27/11/39

Rolandus Phebe, prep. Weseberg., pro ep. et clero Posnaburg. dio., 30/8/32

Potonus Iterii, pr. s. Mich. Sistaric., o.s.B., 4/3/40

quidam fr. o. Predicatorum, 30/5/32

gen. Predicatorum o., 5/5/33

Joh. de Ragusa, o. P., mag. theo., proc. o., 5/4/31

Preduogius de Grande, prep. Gnesn., 22/10/34

Joh. Wyffleti (Hufleti), proc. ab. o. Premonst., 6/3/32

pr. Furn., o. Premonst., pro ab. et o., 6/6/32

pr. Premonst., 6/6/32

proc. o. Premonst., 15/7/32

ab. s. Leonardi, Salamantine dio., o. Premonst., pro abb. eiusdem o. in regno Castelle et Legion. constitutis, 15/10/34

ab. o. Premonst., 5/12/32

mag. Joh. Gerardi, lic. in leg., sacrista Aqu. pro d. rege Ludo. et patria Provincie, 17/4/34

provincialis prov. Provincie, o. M., 14/3/33

ab. s. Prudencii, pro ep. Galugurritano, 17/12/34

ab. de Prulliaco, o. Cist., 26/2/32

fr. And. Pfaffendorf et duo doctores seculares lecto mandato dd. de Prussia, 7/4/33

Pet. de Trilla, decr. doc., ardiac. Lodov., 6/8/32
-adm. et inc. nom. ab. Psalmodi., Nemas. dio., 4/11/33

Joh. de Hungaria, pro ep. Quinqueeclesie, 10/12/34

ep. Quinqueeccl., 2/3/33 (Joan. Czirkel)

Quiricus, ab. s. Sirij. o.s.B., 25/4/32

Racellus, preceptor Janue s. Joh. Jher., 16/5/32
 -pro et nom. mag. gen. o.s. Joh. Jher., 4/12/33

Rachelus de Hauro Ianuensis, o.s. Ioannis Iher., preceptor, 10/38

Radulphus Augur, mag. in art. et lic. in decr., Paris., 5/11/34

Radulphus Fabri, mag. in art., cur. de Bornovilla, Rothomag. dio., 12/8/35

fr. Radulphus Ferrant, pr. conv. de Vitreyo, Redon. dio., 24/4/33

mag. Radulphus de Porta, 10/10/32
 -adm. pro et nom. ep. Castr., 17/6/33

fr. Jacobus de Pisis, o.P., pro clero Ragusino, 30/4/34

fr. Ray. Beronis, pr. priorat. de Elysona, Auxitane dio., 13/11/33

Ray. Buxe, dec. eccl. coll. s.Felicis de Carmano, Tholosane dio., 13/8/34

Ray. de Cortibas, rect. de Fuguerol, beneficiatus in eccl. Terracon. presb., 16/10/39
 -nom. proc. multum nobilis et prepotentis viri, d. Joh. Dixar, pr. eccl. s. Marie del Pilar Cesaraugustane, ardiac. majoris eccl. Tarracon., de prosapia d. regis Arragonum, 10/2/40

Ray. Olbiola, doc. decr., 9/38

Rai. Albiola, doc. in decr., 9/37

fr. Ray. de Prevenqueriis, in decr. bac., camerarius Aniane, Magalon. dio., 4/3/40

Ray. Selle, presb. beneficiatus in eccl. de Pratis, Eln. dio., 31/7/39

Ray. Taloni, decr. doc., viceregens camere apost., prep. Forqualquerii in personam provincialis Provincie, o. Carm., 16/1/34
-inc., decr. doc., prep. eccl. Folquaquerii, 10/12/34

mag. Ray. Talonis, lic. in decr., can. Vivari., 10/7/33

Alf. Lupi de Heredia, bac. in decr., can. eccl. Conch. et Ramundus Taloni, pro et nom. mag. Guillermi de Lira, 21/10/35

Ray. de Terrone, sacrista eccl. cath. s. Poncii Thomeriarum, 22/5/39

fr. Raphael Cardonna, mag. in theo., o.P., 9/8/32

Joh. de Sannam, proc. ep. Swerin. et Rasburg., 2/8/31

Rasse, can. reg. Morin. dio., 13/11/33

Rasso Ubrunell, 17/10/33

ep. Ratisbon. et vic. Frinsing., pro d. duc. Willeamo, protectore, 14/5/34 (Conradus de Soest)

dec. Ratispon., 23/2/32

Raumundus Roberti, doc. in decr., 8/37

fr. Reginaldus Fabri, custos custodie Viromendis, 27/6/32

Reinaldus Fenel, proc. Rabini Fenel, ep. Spir., translati Trever., 19/3/32

Reynaldus de s. Mathio, religiosus mon. s. Mathie, Trever., 24/3/32

fr. Theo. Mersembergh, camerarius mon. s. Marie in Reinerstoph, Maguntin. dio., pro ab., 30/3/34

Reynerius Bulla, presb. rect. parr. eccl. s. Laurencii de Candelo, Vercell. dio., 17/11/41

Reynerus de Hesbon, presb. can. b. Rumoldi Machlini. et rect. in Waura, Camerac. et Leodi. dio., 18/5/36

mag. Jac. de Attigniaco, utr. iur. doc., can. Rem., nom. suo proprio et capitulorum Rem. et Cathalaun., 24/4/33

provincialis Reni, o. heremit. s. A., 22/5/33

Henr. Boldenberch, can. Butzoy., pro ep. Revali., 14/1/35

Richardus Lathomi, can. s. Ypoliti, Bisuntin. dio., 31/7/39

Richardus de Windeke, pro commendatore domus Stenvord., o.s. Joh., Monasteri. dio., 27/11/39

Rigaldus Rock, pr. secularis eccl. b. Marie Sangane, Ruthen. dio., 4/2/35

mag. Joh. Mekes, proc. arep. Rig. et ep. Tarbat., 5/5/33

Theo. Nagel, can. Rig., pro arep. Rig., 23/1/34

Jac. Grone, pro arep. Rig., 23/1/34

Theo. Nagel, can. Rig., proc. huius prov., 7/37

Rinaldus Vivarezii, vic. de Mimassone, proc. Berengarius Petra, 7/7/32

Pet. Sommardi, pro ep. Riv., 20/4/34

ab. s. Marie de Ripalda, Tardon. dio., 4/5/36

Rob. de Bellomonte, religiosus Maioris Monasterii, 27/2/33

Rob. de Brena, can. reg. mon. de Habundancia, rect. parr. eccl. de Cussiaco, Gebenn. dio., de licencia superioris sui, 8/7/40

Rob. Burrilioni, presb. can. eccl. Vigintimili., 28/6/43

mag. Rob. au Clou, proc. d. ducis Burgundie, 9/4/34

Rob. de Coanach, mag. in art., dec. eccl. Dumbl. in Scocia, 23/12/35

Rob. Colibovis, can. et succentor, Senon., 23/12/35

Rob. de Cramburgha, can. Tergest., 27/10/36

Rob. de Cuculis, lic. in leg., subdiac. eccl. s. Aniani, Aureli., 24/4/34

Rob. de Essche, lic. in theo., 2/37

Rob. de Fardella, proc. Ludo. Scaec, 6/7/32

Rob. de Gluiden, can. et scol. eccl. Tungr., Leodi. dio., nobili genere procreatus, 20/6/39

Rob. Herbert, pr. priorat. conv. de Fuesineta, o.s.B., Rothomag. dio., 17/4/39

Rob. ad Iocalia, pro tribus abb. civitatis Met., 2/3/33

Rob. Latrie, clericus serviens armorum, 13/11/33

Rob. Magistri, dec. Bituric., 8/7/35

Rob. Managny, mag. in art., Paris., can. Ebredu., 19/8/35

mag. Rob. de Mera, 17/4/34

Rob. de Molendino, mag., 30/3/32

Rob. de Poers, dec. Limric. et ardiac. Lismor., pro arep. Cassell. et eius suffraganeis de Ybernia et nom. privato, 24/4/34

fr. Rob. Portriau, sacrista b. Marie Burgimedii, Bles., o.s.A., Carnot. dio., 14/7/36

Rob. Ruello, bac. in leg., can. eccl. coll. s. Guillermi, Brioc., 21/8/39

Rob. de Rupecula, ab. mon. s. Poncii extra muros Nici., o.s.B., 25/8/41

Rob. Sybolle, in theo. doc., 11/38

mag. Rob. Venatoris, bac. in decr., 20/11/33

Rod. de Arevallo, in leg. bac., porcionarius Burg., pro d. Ludovico Nunii de Toleto, decr. doc., cantore eccl. Burg. serenissimus d. regi Castelle, cancellario., 16/11/36

Rod. de Carvayal, clericus Placentine dio., 4/2/33

Rod. Fernandi de Fermosilia, can. Cartagin., 24/4/33

Rod. Gundissalui de Gonuel du Sat, pr. secularis eccl. coll. b. Marie de Roa, Oxom. dio., 23/7/34
-pro Fernando Gundissalui, rect. dicte ville de Gomel, 29/10/34

Rod. Luppi, bac. in decr., Ispanus, 4/3/33

Rod. s. de Arevalo, in leg. bac., 22/10/34

Rod. de Varges, can. Tholetanus, 9/2/33

Rodolphus de Chambergh, can. eccl. Herbipol., 27/4/36

mag. Rodolphus de Rudersheim, decr. doc., Varmaci., 16/4/34

Rodolphus Eglofft, proc. mon. Mariscelle, Constanci. dio., o.s.B., proprio nom., 3/7/39

Rodolphus de Lamousaye, s. Albini, Nanat. prep., 7/37

Rodolphus Roberti, cur. eccl. maioris de Tassonevillo, 25/9/33

Rogerius Militis, prep. et can. eccl. b. Kiriaci et b. Marie de Prumino, Senon. dio., 6/8/35

Rogerius Sohierii, can. Villenove iuxta Avinion., 26/9/32

Rogerus de Dick, can. Leodi. et ardiac. in eadem, 17/10/33

Guillermus Rollandi, in decr. lic., pro d. Rogero de Hautpin, in art. mag., can. Tur., consiliario illustrissimus d. ducis Alanconii, 26/10/39

Rogerus Wlstal, scol. eccl. Ascind., Coloni. dio., 11/3/35

Rolandus Magnini, in decr. bac., rect. eccl. parr. de Rumeneyo, Jugdun. dio., 23/7/40

mag. Rolandus de Pencoetdic, lic. in leg., 22/9/36

Rolandus Phebe, prep. Weseberg. pro ep. et clero Posnaburg. dio., 30/8/32

Rolandus Rodeclin, in utr. bac., 1-2/39

Rolinus Rackershein de Scocia, in art. mag., vic. in eccl. de Krania, Dunckeld. dio., 1/7/40

pr. Romani, Monasterii, Lausan. dio., 4/6/34

ab. de Romaniono, o.s.B., Novari. dio., 4/7/32

Nic. Stok, amb. d. romanorum regis, 13/6/32

amb. seren. princ. d. imp. romanorum, d. Pet., ep. August., prov. Magunt., 2/3/36 fr. Romeus de Corbana, dec. b. Marie de Montesia, s. Georgii, 7/8/39

ab. de Rosis, Gerund. dio., 3/38

ab. de Rota, o. Premonst., Constanci. dio., 16/2/33

ab. Audoeni, Rothomag., 3/7/33

Hugo de Ordeo, Cabilon. ep. arep. Rothomag. elect., 12/4/32

mag. Joh. Coleti, presb. in decr. lic., pro ab. s. Audeoni, Rothomag. et suo nom. proprio, 24/4/33

ab. s. Katherine, prope Rothomag., 31/8/36

fr. Yuo de Gruny, pro ab. Rothomag., Venet. dio., 16/4/34

Rukerus, ab. in Grascop., o.s.B., Coloni. dio., 31/8/36

abb. mon. in Runn, o. Cist., Salzeburg. dio., 11/5/36

Franc. Luppi, dec. in Fribourc, pro et nom. ab. et conv. mon. s. Ruperti, Constanci. dio., prov. Maguntin., 28/4/32

Guil. Ebles, pro et nom. cap. Ruth., o.can. reg., s. Flori. dio., 18/3/33

ep. Ruth., 16/6/33 (Guilelmus de la Tour)

quidam doctor ex parte ac ut amb. ill. d. ducis Sabaudie, 7/2/32

mag. Joh. Quentin, lic. in leg., adm. per dd. deputatos pro d. ep. Sagi., 12/8/35

ep. Sagi., 6/7/36 (Joannes Chevalier)

Joh. de Perusia, ep. Sagi., 27/10/38

Joh. Alfonsi, doc. in sac, pag., pro u. Salamantin., 27/8/34

ab. s. Leonardi, Salamantine dio., o. Premonst., pro abb. eiusdem o. in regno Castelle et Legionis constitutis, 15/10/34

Salvator Marebonis, can. Venci., 27/8/34

Mart. Celer, bac. in decr., pro abb. non exemptis, o.s.B., Salzburg. dio., 2/1/33

amb. arep. Salzburg, 11/12/31

Vernondus Vasi, pro ep. et cap. Samor., 8/4/35

Sampson de Lalain, ardiac. de Ostrevanno, 3/2/33

Samson Pitin, in leg. lic., 25/6/40

Sanxius Fernandi, can. Cauri., 23/1/34

ab. s. Pauli de Mezano de Placencia, pro se ipso et ep. Saon., 3/9/34

proc. Saon. ep., 31/5/32

ep. Sappat., 15/2/34 (Matthaeus de Hermdao)

ep. Sardan., 15/5/33 (Pet. Matthias Pribissa)

Ayquilinus de Vinhali, capel. legati, prep. s. Severini extra muros Brudegal., 23/9/32
-proc. d. ep. Sarlat., 26/5/33

Pet. de Trillia, decr. doc., ardiac. Lodov., 6/8/32
-proc. d. ep. Sarlat., 26/5/33

Joh. Albaneti, pr. de Ladis Magalon. dio., o. can. reg., pro et nom. d. ab. mon. Savilliani, 4/2/34

Joh. de Bachemstein, prep. eccl. Herbipol., proc. et nom. proc. r. p. d., Sigismundi, ep. Herbipol., et Saconi ducis, 20/10/41

prov. Saxonie, o.P., 4/7/32

proc. ep., cap. Secovi., 6/6/32

Guil., ep. et comes Sedun., 23/11/39 (Guil. de Rarognia)

Gisebertus, Segobric. ep., 4/38 (Gilbertus Martini, o.s. Hieronymus)

ab. mon. in Selighenstat, o.s.A., 31/8/36

fr. Nic. Rozembergh, pr. Selle d. Pauline, pro ab., 30/3/34

ab. s. Marie, Sest., 10/7/33

fr. Severus de Forcada, pro ab. s. Severi, Aduri. dio., 2/9/35

fr. Sibundus Alamandi, pr. s. Donati, Vien. dio., 14/3/33

Siffridus in Sussienheim, Spir. ab., 2/37

Sifirigus de Benighuen, can. Spir., 10/9/34

Sigismundus, ab. de Alto Vado, Prag. dio., o. Cist., 21/5/34

Sigismundus de Bellonis, decr. doc., arpresb. Queri., 26/10/39

Sygismundus, pleb. in Rzczycainyz, Leopoli. dio., capel. r. d. arep. Leopol., 14/7/41

proc. ep. Silv., 2/37

Silvester Salome, in utr. bac., 9/38

mag. Sym. Biderman, can. Sedun., 23/11/39

Sym. Brouilla, dec. et can., Lingon., mag. in art., 5/11/34

fr. Sym. Canbier, pr. priorat. b. Marie de Nulliaco, dio. Belvac., 27/2/33

Sym. Coigni, pr. de Medunta, Carnot. dio., pro ab. de Columbis, 21/8/34

Sym. Freron, 17/7/33

Sym. de Guilgolphis, s. Ioh. Baptiste de Mediolan., vic. gen., 9/38

mag. Sym. Messis, lic. in decr., can. et sacrista eccl. Valentin., 16/4/34

Sym. Pinguisdepane, in sacra pag. professor, pro ep. Claromont., 12/6/34

Sym. Rawelk, rect. parr. eccl. de Wynzelle, Morni. dio., 23/7/34

Sym. Reizer, bac. in theo., provincialis Almanie superioris, vic. gen. A., pro o., 23/1/34

mag. Sym. de Theramo, advocatus, 12/6/33

Sym. de Valle, auditor card. Bononi., 16/5/32
-pro nacione Italice, 10/7/32
-proc. ep. Bononi., 5/9/32
-nom. cap. et civium Herbipol., 7/2/33

Sym. de Witlick, personatus eccl. Ursensis, Trever. dyo., 5/38

fr. Joh. Reginaldi, mon. professus elemosinarius ac proc. mon. s. Simphoriani, extra muros Met., o.s.B., 13/11/39

ab. Syz, Gebenn. dio., 21/11/32

Joh. Weghennere, cur. parr. eccl. s. Joh. in Frer, dio. Sleswic, proc. ep. et cap. Sleswic., 2/8/32

Joh. Rikonnen, pro scol. Spir., 1/12/36

mag. Hugo de Rot, pro cap. Spir., dec., 13/11/33

Reinaldus Fenel, proc. trans. Spir., 19/3/32

Joh. Pollart, proc. prep. eccl. s. Spiritus Ruremundus, Leodi. dio., nom. proprio, 27/6/39

Stanislaus Yzdonca, can. eccl. Cracovi., 23/12/39

fr. Joh. Ledenis, pr. de Mirabello, o.s.A., Lingon. dio., pro ab. s. Stephani de Divione, 26/7/32

ab. mon. s. Stephani, Herbipol. dio., 30/3/34

Steph. Augas, mag. in art., can. Ebredun., 15/4/40

mag. Steph. ex nobilis de Bandellis de Castro Novo, Terdon. dio., sacre theo. et. decr. doc., o.P., 8/7/40

Steph. Bedelli, in utr. iur. bac., can. Bituric., 5/3/34

mag. Joh. Slaczenrois, promotor sacri concilii, nom proc. d. Stephani Behem, prep. eccl. b. Marie in Scurtad extra muros Bamberg., 3/11/41

Steph. Brossandi, bac. in utr. iur., 17/6/40

Steph. Burreti, ab. mon. novi Pictav., o. Clun., 3/10/39

mag. Steph. Callau, cur. ss. Innocentum, Paris., 16/1/34

Steph. de Cassis de Novaria, leg. doc., 9/4/32
    -onus procuracionis ab. s. Martini, Papi., 9/4/32
    -tam proprio nom. quam nom. ab. s. Lanfranchi, Papi., 14/4/32
    -adm. et inc. pro et nom. ab. s. Salvatoris de Sexto, Luca., et pr. s. Frediani de Luca, 13/8/33

Steph. Castelli, mon. et infirmarius mon. s. Genesii, Eln. dio., bac. in decr., 12/6/39

mag. Steph. Fabri, can. Ambian., 17/2/36

Steph. Ferrot, ardiac. Pomeranie in eccl. Wladislavi., 27/5/40

Steph. Foresii, 26/3/35

Steph. Francisci de Prato, Florentin. dio., 9-10/42

Steph. Gigonardi, can. s. Justi, Lugdun. dio., 28/7/36

Steph. Yuer, in personam Henricci de Biura, 29/5/33

Steph. Lamberti, can. Hogi. et rect. parr. eccl. in Ouldewater, Traject. dio., 8/1/40

Steph., ab. b. Marie Burgimedii Blesensis, o.s.A., Carnot. dio., 14/7/36

Steph., prep. eccl. s. Marie de Gurtziano, Brixin. dio., 19/3/34

fr. Steph., minister gen. o.s.B., Mediolan., 13/4/36

Steph. Nicolai, preceptor s. Ant. de Alexandria, 23/10/39

Steph. de Orba, dec. eccl. coll. Montisbiligardi, Bisuntin. dio. suo et cap. sui proc. nominibus ..., 6/8/35

Steph. Plomerii, lic. in decr., 4/6/34

Steph. Reavle, bac. in decr., rect. parr. eccl. de Carneto, Narbon. dio., 28/3/38

Steph. de Roseriis, can. Silvanect., 18/2/35

Steph. de Rupecissa, nepos d. card. Rothomag., 24/4/33

Steph. de Vasz, pr. priorat. s. Uldarici, Basil. dio., o.s.A., bac. in decr., 19/8/35 mag. Albertus de Viadin, pro arep. Strigoni., 25/8/36

Nicholas Clerici, ardiac. Nitri. et can. Strigon., nuncius
    et amb. dd. arep. Strigon. et trium suffreganeorum,
    16/2/32
    -proc. d. arep. Strigon., 16/4/32

vic. Strigon., 30/6/33

Anth., ep. Sud., 21/8/32

Suecus Roderici, can. Genn., arpresb. de Kesal. Toletane
    dio., 27/4/36

Ray., Sulsitan. ep., 11-12-42 (Rai. de Torres)

Joh. de Sannam, proc. ep. Swerin. et Rasborg., 2/8/31

Talabardus Tadoti, pr. priorat. Veracerii, Vienn. dio.,
    o.s.B., 9/5/39

Nic., ep. Tan. in Tartaria, 22/5/33 (Nic. de Troja, o.M.)

mag. Joh. Mekes, proc. arep. Rig. et ep. Tarbat., 5/5/33

Joh., arep. Tarentasi., 26/10/39 (Joh. de Arciis)

Joh. de Mutonibus, pro cap. eccl. Tarusine, 9/4/34

Pet. Ridonus, pro cap. eccl. Tarusino, 9/4/34

Franc. de Pistorio, pro d. ep. Taurin., 20/7/36

Ludo., ep. Taurin., 25/6/39 (Ludo. de Romagnano)

d. ab. de Terciis, o.s.B., 14/5/32

ab. s. Marciani, Terdon. dio., 4/11/33

ep. Ternipol., 15/5/33

proc. Terton. ep., 1/38

ab. Nerviesie, Tervi. dio., 12/2/34

Joh. Selburch, cur. in persona, o. Teut., et mag. Theodoricus
    Nagel, can. eccl. Rig., pro mag. dicti o. per Livoniam,
    2/1/40

Theobaldus Tilonis, in leg. lic., 3/38

Theo., ab. mon. s. Mich., Hildesm., o.s.B., 23/3/36

Theo. Balke, in med. doc., 30/3/33

Theo. Berbolt, lic. in decr., 7/38

Theo. Ebracht, can. Ascaffamburg., 16/8/32

mag. Theo. Frudell de Lyuonia, can. Reval., 14/1/35

Theo. de Geysen, pro se et arep. Bremen., 25/5/36

Theo. Herden, 29/5/33

Theo. Jad, can. eccl. s. Quirini, Nussi., pro cap. Nussi., 17/10/32

Theo. Knebel, can. Maguntin., proc. et nom. proc. cap. eiusdem eccl., 28/1/32

fr. Theo. Maer, religiosus, pro ab. s. Adlaberti, Traiect. dio., o.s.B., 5/3/34

fr. Theo. Mersembergh, camerarius mon. s. Marie in Reinerstoph, Maguntin. dio., pro ab., 30/3/34

fr. Theo. Nagel, can. Rig., pro arep. Rig., 23/1/34

Theo. Nagel, can. Rig., proc. huius prov., 7/37

Theo. Nagel, can. eccl. Rig., pro mag. dicti o. per Livoniam (o. Theutonicorum), 2/1/40

Theo. Steykamp, presb. rect. parr. eccl. in Demzat, dio. Traject., et can. eccl. s. Pet. Toralt., Tornac. dio., 31/7/39

Theo. Winckel, in decr. lic., 3/39

Egidius Ogerii, can. Rem. pro se et ab. s. Thiberii, Agath. dio., 24/4/34

mag. Thilmanus Grisler, pro studio Erphord., 20/11/33

fr. Thom. Avis, conv. Met., 25/5/33

fr. Thom. Becqman, elect. in ab. mon. s. Lamberti, Liess., o.s.B., Camerac. dio., 12/2/40

Thom. de Bordella, arpresb. Perusin. et can. Florentin., decr. doc., 5/3/34

Thom. Caley, can. eccl. cath. Engolism. et cur. eccl. parr.
    s. Viviani de Bamesellis, Xanton. dio., 15/4/40

Thom. Chesnoleti, notarius scriptor concilii, dec. s.
    Simphonarii, Rem., 29/4/32
    -proc. Joh. Joneti, 23/12/33

Thom. de Cornucervino de Stetin, Camin. dio., doc. med.,
    10/6/40

Thom. de Courcellis, nom. d. ep. Ambian., 24/4/33

Thom. ab. de Dondranaen de Scocia, o. Cist., 14/11/32

Thom. Durandi, in theo. doc., 10/38

Thom. Fiene, decr. doc., off. Paris., amb. u. Paris., can.
    Camerac., 21/4/31

Thom. Francisci, pro cap. Constanci., prov. Rothomag., 21/8/33

mag. Thom. Francisci, pro mag. Ludo. de Borreya, dec. eccl.
    Baoic., 9/4/34

Thom. Geuquerii, lit. apost. abbrev., 13/11/33

Thom. Grane, can. Limric., 27/10/36

mag. Thom. Haube, dec. de Salcoya, 17/4/34

Thom. Hospitis, can. reg., pr. s. Ruffi, 25/2/35

Thom. Inum, bac. in utr., 10/37

Thom. Johannis, in utr. iur. bac., 28/3/38

Thom. Josselin, lic. in dec., can. Cenoman., 1/12/35

Thom. Langens, mag. in art., can. eccl. coll., Buritin., Misn.
    dio., 11/3/40

fr. Thos. Lusdii, in decr. lic., auditor Xancton., 20/11/39

Thom. Macmachuna. ardiac. Limiric., 29/4/35

Thom. Matheus Riere, pr. et can. eccl. b. Marie de Solsana,
    Urgell. dio., 31/7/39

Thom. de Myrtoen, dec. eccl. Glasgu., 8/2/34

Thom. Morbech, lic. in decr., pro et nom. ep. et cap. Morin., 3/10/32

Thom. le Piguier, can. Constanci., mag. in art. et lic. in decr., 12/8/35

Thom., scol. maior in eccl. Quinque Ecclesiarum., 2/3/33

Thom. Rode, 3/9/34

Thom. Rode, nom. proc. d. Conradi, elect. Argentin., 23/1/40

Thom. Rode, pro Joh., ep. Verden, 17/12/34

Thom. Safa, monachus s. Anthonii, 2/3/36

Thom. de Stampino de Polonia, can. Gnezn., decr. doc., pro arep. Gnezn., 17/10/33

Thom. de Tulach. ardiac. Cathin., bac. in decr., 14/5/34

Thom. Wiennensis, u. doc. theo., amb. ducis Alberti Austrie,
5/7/32
-24/10/32

Thomasius de Cellis, decr. doc., 4/37

mag. Joh. Tinelli, pro arep. Tholosano, 16/4/34

d. prep. Thuric., nom. d. ep. Constanci., prov. Maguntin.,
11/12/31
-nom. ep. Basil., 23/7/35

ep. Tiburtin., 19/11/34 (Nic. Cesari)

fr. Tillmannus, prep. s. Marie de Paupla, dio. Taurin., o.s.B. et monachus mon. Fructuari., 23/10/39

Tilmannus de Droilhaghen, dec. eccl. ss. Martini et Severi in Melsech, 18/6/34

Tillmannus, ab. Savonis, Valentin. dio., o.s.A. can. reg., 21/6/40

Tilmannus de Lunss, decr. doc. et amb. u. Colon., 19/12/32

Mart., Tirason. ep., 9/37 (Mart. Cerdani)

Pet. Remigii, scol. Tolet., proc. d. arep. Toletain. et d. ep. Cartagin., 22/10/34

Tomerius Bussi, pleb. Publinarum, o.s.A., dio. Taurin., cap.
r. p. d. ep. Taurin., 1/12/41

Jodocus de Lysa, in sacra pag. prof., pro d. ep. Tornac.,
30/3/33

Guillermus Bloc, can. Tornac. pro d. ep. Tornac., 30/3/33

ep. Torsellanus, 9/4/34 (Philippus Paruta, o. eremit. s. A.)

ab. Tortona, 11/4/32

Henricus Schater, art. et med. doc., dec. eccl. Traiect.
pro r. p. d. Swedero, ep. Traiect. et clero, 17/9/31

Joh. Zoermont, art. et decr. doc., pro ep. Traiect., 21/8/32

Swederus, ep. Traiect., 4/9/32 (Swederus de Culenborch)

Joh. Passart, pr. o. can. reg. in Traiect., pro d. ep.
Traiect. et nom. proprio, 13/1/33

Pet. Passart, can. eccl. b. Marie, Traiect., tam propria quam
cleri Traiect. nom., 17/9/34

Pet. de Mera it Guil. Gerardi de Ledis, decr. doc., pro ep.
et clero Traiect., 2/4/34

Ghiselbertus Herman, can. eccl. cath. Traiect., pro se et
clero., 17/9/34

Eustacius Franieri, bac. in utr., in proc. nom. d. ep.
Trec., 5/9/33
-10/9/33

Ioh., ep. Trec., 11/38 (Joh. Acuti)

fr. Amadeus, pr. de Donzera, pro ab. Trenorchi., 16/4/34

Reynaldus Fenel, proc. d. Rabani Fenel, ep. Spir., translati
Trever., 19/3/32

Job, cum socio pro d. translato Trever., 2/1/33

Helbicus de Bopardia, dec. Wesali., 28/2/32
-proc. cleri, communis, civ. et dio. Trever., 24/3/32

ab. s. Mathie extra muros Trever., o.s.B., proc. cleri,
communis, civitatis et dio. Trever., 29/2/32

ab. s. Maximi, extra muros Trever., 23/7/34 dec. Trever., 15/5/33

electus Triburni. (ep.), 18/9/33

Gaspar Paulocii de Theramo, can. Aprutin. pro ep. Tricari., 21/8/34

Laurencius de Rotella, pro ep. Tricari., 21/8/34

ep. Trident., 16/1/34 (Alexander de Massovia)

Joh. Roden, pro cap. Trident., 28/9/36

Joh. Haureti, ardiac. Tull., pro cap. Tull. et se ipso, 22/6/36

Hugo Barardi, proc. ep. et cleri Tull., 12/31

Hustinus Paulini, pro ep. Tull., 20/4/34

Egidius Ogerii, pro ep. Vabr., 25/8/36

D. Aymericus de Harpaione, pro ep. Vabri., 9/4/34

proc. Valentine ep., 1-2/39

mag. Jac. Alberti, can. Ebredun. nom. cap. Ebredun., cap. Valentin., et cap. Di., 12/9/32

fr. Joh. Noize, pr. priorat. Leonis Montis, Tull. dio., lic. in decr., nom. proc. r. p. d. Valentin. ab. Mudiani mon. dicte dio., 15/7/40

mag. Valentin. Demelhorst, prep. eccl. b. Marie Stetin. et can. Camin., 25/5/36

Valerianus de Albagleria, arpresb., Tridentin. dio., 9-10/42

fr. Joh. Antonii, pro ab. Vallismagne, Agat. dio., o. Cist., 28/7/36

Walterius Camelin, mag. in art., bac. in decr., rect. parr. eccl. de Oulain, dio. Tornac., 2/9/35

Wagangius Priem, bac. in decr., 5/7/32

Warnerius de Auszesz, can. Bamberg., lic. in decr., 10/9/34

Vasco de Cuenna, 10/2/33

Vascus de Meyre, ardiac. de Medina in eccl. Seguntina, 11/8/33

Joh. Spasserii, pro ep. Vauri., 7/4/35

Wedislaus, dec. de Carlestein, Prag. dio., presb., 19/3/34

ab. s. Gregorii de Veneciis, 12/2/34

pr. s. Canielis de Veneciis, 15/3/34

Gerardus de Columpna, leg. doc., can. Vercell., pro et nom. ep. et cap. Vercell., 28/2/33

Thom. Rode, pro Joh., ep. Verden., 17/12/34

Guil., ep. Vercell., 25/6/39

Guil. Chauveti, off. Verden., lic. in decr., proc. Collegiorum, 26/2/32

ab. s. Nicolai Verden., o. can. reg., 10/8/36

procuratores ep. Verdun., 1/32

Werinerus Gruter, prep. s. Andree Colon., 30/3/36

mag. Wernerus Aufses, pro ep. Bamberg., 6/7/36

Wernerus, comes de Vigestenn, prep. s. Gereonis, Colon., 14/7/36

Wernerus Wolmerszhen, bac. in utr., 7/38

Verondus Vasi, pro ep. et cap. Samor., 8/4/35

ab. s. Marie de Verona, 12/2/34

Vicencius, ab. s. Victoris extra muros Mediolan., 7/8/33

fr. Egidius Bocheroul, o. can. reg., pro toto cap. gen. Wydesem., Traiect. dio., 31/8/32

Wyenandus de Glurels, s. Willebrordi, Trever. ab. elect., 4/38

Joh. Celi, amb. u. Wienn., Alberti ducis Austriae, prov. Bavarie, o. A., 5/7/32

Joh., doc. in theo., u. Wienn., nuncius ducis Alberti Austrie, proc. u. Vienn., 5/7/32

Joh. Arnulphi, mag. in art. et lic. in decr., proc. et nom. proc. d. arep. Vienn., 5/11/32
-adm. in proc. pro et nom. cap. coll. de Romanis, Vienn. dio., 12/8/33

Joh. Cherrerii, precentor Lugdun., 17/4/33
-pro cap. Vienn., 17/6/33

Joh. Celi, ... pro et nom. prep. Wien., 5/7/32

Joh. Arnulphi, mag. in art. et lic. in decr., proc. et nom. proc. d. arep. Vienn., 5/11/32

prep. s. Dorothee, Vienn., 29/2/32

Joh. Ghelz, Anglicus, bac. in leg., can. Lubic., proc. dd. Bathon., Lincoln., et Wigorni., 8/3/32

Wilhelmus Cistar, prep., 5/38

Wilhelmus de Dulben, scriptor in registro supplicacionum, can. b. Marie, Wormaci., 14/8/39

Wil., ab. monasterii Fribarg., o.s.B., Curi. dio., 26/9/39

Wil. de Heze, leg. doc. et art. mag., rect. parr. eccl., Novimey., Colon. dio., 23/10/39

Wil. Stahel, rect. parr. eccl. in Harkirchen, alias in Pitzling, Patavi. dio., 9/10/39

Wil. Tournelli, presb. can. et sacrista eccl. Glandac., 9/12/40

Wil. de Treveri, can. capel. et cantor eccl. ss. Martini et Severi mon. Meyenfeld, dio. Trever., in art bac., Paris., 15/5/39

Wil. Winman, can. eccl. Quinqueeccl., 15/7/40

Wilhermus Coma, prep. eccl. cath. Vic., 12/6/39

Wilkinus Koenen, can. Trident., 4/12/39

Patriarcha Anthiocenos, Joh., 19/9/32
-proc. comes de Villariis, 30/6/33

Joh. de s. Severino, prep. Anici., proc. comitis de Villariis, 30/6/33

Vitulus, ab. s. Ruffi, Valentin, proc. comitis de Vallariis, 30/6/33

ep. Ratispon. et vic. Frinsing., pro d. ducis Willeamo, protectore, 14/5/34

Willermus Frome, decr. doc., 26/8/35

Willermus Paedre maioris, mag. pro. d. Ludo., 13/8/34

Willermus Tovidus, 4/3/35

Willibaldus Prechtel, can. s. Gumperti Onolspac., Herbipol. dio., 2/12/40

ep. Vinc., 12/2/34 (Georgius de Ornos)

discretus vir, mag. Matheus de Tribolia, proc. cap. Virdun., 11/4/32

mag. Henr. Hubelin, can. Brixin., pro arep. Visal., 5/3/34

Ludo., ep. Vis., 22/5/33

Vitulus, ab. s. Ruffi, Valentin., proc. comitis de Villariis, 30/6/33

pr. s. Maurini, Vivari., 9/1/33

procuratores ep. Vivari., 1/32

Ulricus Auussi., amb. regis Dacie, inc. in nom. regis, 19/3/34

Ulricus Bremode, prep. de Werda, Salczburg., 1/38

Ul. Cesaris, rect. eccl. parr. in Lutenbach, Herbipol. dio., 12/2/40

Ul., o. Cist., 11/4/32

Ul. Deysler, in art. mag., Paris., et lic. in decr., prep. eccl. b. Marie veteris capel. Ratispon., 27/7/43

Ul. Faeler, commendator seu preceptor domus s. Joh. Jher. in Monester, Ratispon. dio., pro ipso et vice ac nom. conv. ipsius domus, 11/5/32

Ul. Lupi, can. eccl. Wird., rect. parr. eccl. in Nuenwilr, cap. perpetuus in eccl., Basil., 25/6/39

Ul. Messinger, Montis s. Petris, 3-5/42

Ul. Nenigher, decr. doc., 25/6/34

mag. Ul. de Sessia, bac. in leg., rect. eccl. parr. de Atilheyo, Cenoman. dio., 3/10/39

Ul. de Tetyngchiel, in med. mag., 11/37

Ul. Truchesz, cant. Basil., 9-10/42

Ul. de Wastembouuc, de domo d. Ratispon., proc. Ul. Faeler, 11/5/32

Ul. de Werdembergh, comes, can. Argentin., 7/5/34

Volkmarus de Anderten, can. s. ... civitatis Hildesm., 20/11/39

Wolterius Rauelimonde, mag. in art., lic. in decr., can. Tabart., 22/10/34

Henr. de Dyest, decr. doc., pro ep. Warmac., 30/1/33

mag. Joh. Wilstergo, Vormaci., pro ep. Vormaci. et nom. proprio, 5/5/33

mag. Joh. de Montemartiis, proc. ep. et cleri, Wormaci., 1/1/32

Franc. Warmaci., ep., 7/37

arep. Upsali., 23/7/34

quidam doctor pro ep., cap., et clero Wratislavi., 11/2/32

Nic., can. Wratislavi., proc. ep., 8/4/32

Anth. de Bernuciis, pro ep. Vratislavi., 8/7/35

prep. Vratislavi., 18/6/32

ep. de Urbino, o.P., 7/8/33 (Jac. Balardi, o.P.)

ep. Utic., 19/9/32
-proc. regis Cipri, 30/6/33

Xanctus Buctonis, prep. eccl. s. Georgii in castro Gnetzn. ac can. eccl. Gnetzn., 10/3/41

Joh. Martini, capel. d. card. s. Petri, proc. nom. fr. de Belforate ab. s. Zoili de Cardione, o.s.B., Palentine dio., 3/11/36

ADDENDA TO APPENDIX III

prep. Aquebelle, nom. proc. d. ep. August. in Sabaudia et eciam nom. proprio, 12/12/32

Joh. Celi, amb. u. Wienn., Alberti ducis Austriae, prov. Bavarie, p.A., 5/7/32

vic. Maguntin., pro parte cleri, Maguntin., 21/8/33
-pro et nom. electi Baioc., 6/10/33

ab. in Benedicten, August. dio., 16/7/35

ab. Bone Vallis, pro ab. s. Guillermide Deserto, Lodov., 24/4/34

ep. Clugien, 15/5/33 (Paschalinus Centoferri, o. eremit. s. A.)

pr. s. Benigni Divion., mag. in theo., pro ab. eius mon., 30/5/32

Franciscus de la Cruce, decr. doc., primicerius eccl. Mediolan. ex parte ill. princ. d. Philippi Marie, ducis Mediolan., abbrev. apost. lit., 28/1/32

Jac. Gelini, can. Stibann., 3/9/34

Pet. de Trillia, dec. doc., ardiac. Lodov., 6/8/32
-inc. pro ab. s. Illari de s. Ilario, Carcasson., 18/9/33

Joh. Bosqueti, pr. de Verreriis (Quarreriis), Vabr. dio., proc. ep. Petragoric., 7/5/32

Joh., ep. Cabilon., 11/11/31

Ray. de Curtibus, nom proc. multum nobilis et prepotentis viri d. Joh. Dixan, pr. eccl. s. Marie del Pillar, Cesaraugustan., ardiac majoris eccl. Tarracon., de prosapia d. regis Arragonum, 19/2/40

mag. Joh. de s. Genesio., 16/5/32

Joh. de Montenoison, mag. in theo. ut proc. ab. Cluniac., 13/5/32

Pet. de Brena, cant. eccl. Lingon., pro mag. Joh. Gobillon, elect. in ep. Lingon., 17/4/34

Joh. Grummer, r.p. eccl. in Mollisheim, Argent. dio., 1/3/41

Guill. Bonaudi, pro o. s. Joh. Jherosolim. et nom. proprio, 24/12/34

Guill. de Weghe, leg. doc. pro se et ipso et d. de o. s. Joh. Jhero., 4/12/33

The foregoing is an alphabetical list of incorporations into the Council of Basle. The letters "i," "j," and "y" are listed as "i." The letters "u," "v," and "w" are listed as one. An incorporation is listed by the first name of the person incorporated; if the name of the person is not given, the listing is by the place where the Father holds office; and failing this also, the listing is entered by the church, monastery, or corporation with which the person is associated. If none of these data are available, the most significant remaining datum determines the listing. Proctorial incorporations are listed by the name of the proctor and the name of the corporation or person represented. Bishops and their representatives are listed by the name of the See.

Each incorporation is followed by its date given numerically (day, month, year). The months for which we are dependent upon John of Segovia and the first year of the Council (February, 1431, through January, 1943), are simply listed by month and year. Any incorporation listed here may be located in the sources through the index to the source or under the date (or month) attributed to the listing.

The more commonplace names are shortened by omitting the declensional suffixes and, occasionally, the lingual "i." A list of abbreviations and contractions follows.

A.	Augustinus	can.	canonicus
ab.	abbas	cap.	caput
abb.	abbates	capel.,capell.,	capellanus
abbrev., abbr.	abbreviator	Cart., Carth.	Carthusia
adm.	admissus	cath.	cathedra
Alb.	Albertus	Cist., Cisterc.	Cistercia
Alf.	Alfonsus	cl.	clericus
amb.	ambassiator	coll.	collegium
And.	Andreas	Con.	Conradus
Ant.	Antonius	Conr.	Conrardus
Anth.	Anthonius	conv., convent.	conventus
apost.	apostolicus	cur., curat.,	curatus
ardiac.	archidiaconus	d.	dominus
arep.	archiepiscopus	dd.	domini
Arn.	Arnoldus	dec.	decanus
art.	artes	decr.	decretales
Aug., August.	Augustinus	diac.	diaconus
B.	Benedictus	dio.	diocesus
Barth.	Bartholomeus	Dyo.	Dyonisius
b.	beatus, beata	doc.	doctor
bac.	bacalarius	Dom.	Dominicus
beneficiat.	beneficiatus	eccl.	ecclesia
Bern.	Bernardus	elect.	electus

ep.	episcopus
fam.	familiaris
form.	formatus
Franc.	Franciscus
Fred.	Fredericus
Geo.	Georgius
gen.	generalis
Ger.	Gerardus
Guil.	Guillelmus
Guill.	Guillermus
Hen.	Henricus
Henr.	Henrricus
heremit.	heremetica
Herm.	Hermannus
humil., Hum.	Humilitatus
Jac.	Jacobus
Jher.	Jherosolimitanum
imp.	imperator
inq.	inquisitor
Ioan.	Ioannes
Joh.	Johannes
ir.	iure
Laur.	Laurencius
lect.	lector
leg.	leges
lic.	licenciatus
lit., litt.	litteras
Ludo.	Ludovicus
mag.	magister
Mart.	Martinus
med.	medicina
Mich.	Michaelis
mon.	monasterium
monach.	monachus
Nic.	Nicolaus
nom.	nominus
o.	ordo
p.	pater
parr.	parrochia
Pet.	Petrus
pleb.	plebanus
pr.	prior
prebend.	prebendatus
precept.	preceptor
Premonstrat., Premon.	Premonstratensis
prep.	prepositus
presb.	presbyter
priorat.	prioratus
princ.	princeps
proc.	procurator, procuratoria
prof.	professor
prov.	provincia
r.	reverendus, reverendissimus
Ray.	Raymundus
rect.	rector
reg.	regularis
Rob.	Robertus
Rod.	Rodericus
rom.	romanus
s.	sanctus, sancta
sac., sacr.	sacrista
scol.	scolasticus
sec.	secular
secr.	secretarius
seren.	serenissimus
Sym.	Symonus
Steph.	Stephanus
Teut.	Teutonicus
Theo.	Theodericus
thes.	thesaurius
theo.	theologia
Theut.	Theutonicorum
Thom.	Thomas
vic.	vicarius
Wil.	Wilhelmus
Ul.	Ulricus
u., uni.	universitas
utr.	utriusque

VITA

Dean Loy Bilderback, the son of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Bilderback, was born in Enid, Oklahoma, on September 25, 1932. He attended the public schools in Wakita, Oklahoma, and graduated from Wakita High School in 1950.

He attended Northern Oklahoma Junior College, where he graduated in 1952, and the University of Kansas from which he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in History in 1955 and his Master of Arts degree in History in 1957. He continued his graduate work at Christian-Albrechts Universität in Kiel, Germany, the Rice Institute in Houston, Texas, and the University of Washington in Seattle, Washington, which he entered in 1959.

Since 1962 Mr. Bilderback has been a member of the faculty of Fresno State College, where he is an Assistant Professor in the Department of History.